arXiv:1610.03270v1 [math.AP] 11 Oct 2016

SCHAUDER ESTIMATES AT THE BOUNDARY FOR SUB-LAPLACIANS IN CARNOT GROUPS

ANNALISA BALDI, GIOVANNA CITTI, GIOVANNI CUPINI

Abstract. In this paper we prove Schauder estimates at the boundary for sub-Laplacian type operators in Carnot groups. While internal Schauder estimates have been deeply studied, up to now subriemannian estimates at the boundary are known only in the Heisenberg groups. The proof of these estimates in the Heisenberg setting, due to Jerison ([30]), is based on the Fourier transform technique and can not be repeated in general Lie groups. After the result of Jerison no new contribution to the boundary problem has been provided. In this paper we introduce a new approach, which allows to built a Poisson kernel starting from the fundamental solution, from which we deduce the Schauder estimates at non characteristic boundary points.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Aim of this work.** The aim of this work is to prove Schauder estimates at the boundary for sub-Laplacian type operators in Carnot groups.

As it is well known, Schauder estimates at the boundary in the Euclidean setting are based on two main ingredients. The first one, which is the hearth of the Schauder method, is the local reduction of general uniformly elliptic operators to the Laplace operator. The second one, which seems elementary in the Euclidean setting, is a reflection technique which reduces the boundary Schauder estimates to internal ones. Unfortunately, this technique can not be applied in the strong anisotropic setting of a Carnot group, since a Laplace type operator in this framework is not invariant with respect to reflection, nor can be approximated by any invariant operator. In the special case of the Heisenberg group, Schauder estimates are a classical result due to Jerison (see [30]), but not even this technique, based on the standard Fourier transform, can be extended to general Lie groups, whose geometry is not related to the Fourier transform. After that, no new contribution has been provided to the problem, which is still open, while its solution would be necessary for the development of nonlinear PDE's theory in this setting.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R03, 35B65, 35J25.

Key words and phrases. Schauder estimates at the boundary, Poisson kernel, sub-Riemannian geometry, Carnot groups .

The authors are supported by University of Bologna, funds for selected research topics, and by the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007-2013/ under REA grant agreement n. 607643. The first and the third author are supported by GNAMPA of INdAM, Italy.

In this paper we introduce a completely different approach, which is new even in the Riemannian setting, and which allows to built a Poisson kernel starting from the knowledge of a smooth fundamental solution for the problem on the whole space. In principle, this point of view could be fruitful in other geometric setting where reflection is not possible.

1.2. **Carnot groups.** A Carnot group $\mathbb{G}$ can be identified with $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a polynomial group law $(\mathbb{G}, \cdot)$, whose Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ admits a step κ stratification, i.e. there exist linear subspaces $V^1, ..., V^\kappa$ such that

$$\mathfrak{g} = V^1 \oplus ... \oplus V^\kappa, \quad [V^1, V^{i-1}] = V^i, \text{ if } i \leq \kappa, \quad [V^1, V^\kappa] = \{0\}. \tag{1.1}$$

We will call horizontal tangent bundle the subspace V^1, and we will choose one of its bases $\{X_1, \cdots, X_m\}$. By the assumption on the Lie algebra, it can be completed to a basis $\{X_1, \cdots, X_n\}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ with the list of their commutators. Several equivalent left invariant distances d can be introduced in terms of these vector fields (see for example Nagel, Stein and Wainger in [38]). The sub-Riemannian gradient of a regular function f will be denoted $\nabla f = (X_1 f, \cdots, X_m f)$ and f will be called of class C^1 if this gradient is continuous with respect to the distance d. More generally, spaces of Hölder continuous functions $C^{k,\alpha}$ can be defined in terms of this distance and this gradient. We will study here a subelliptic operator expressed as follows:

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (X_i^2 + b_i X_i), \tag{1.2}$$

for regular coefficients b_i. Operators of this type are hypoelliptic and have been deeply studied, after the first works of Folland and Stein [20], Rothschild and Stein [39], Jerison and Sanchez-Calle [32], Kohn and Nirenberg [33] and Jerison [30, 31] (see also [3] for a recent monography). Their fundamental solution Γ_Δ is of class C^∞ far from the diagonal and it can be estimated in term of the distance as follows

$$\Gamma_\Delta(x, y) \approx \frac{1}{d^{Q-2}(x, y)}, \tag{1.3}$$

for a suitable integer Q, called homogeneous dimension of the space (see (2.7) for a precise definition). A kernel with the behavior of Γ_Δ is called of local type 2. In general we will say that a kernel is of local type λ with respect to the distance d if for every open bounded set V and for every $p \geq 0$ there exists a positive constant C_p such that, for every $x, y \in V$, with $x \neq y$

$$|X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_p} k(x, y)| \leq C_p d(x, y)^{\lambda - p - 2} \Gamma_\Delta(x, y). \tag{1.4}$$

More precise definitions are given in Section 2 and in Section 4.

A well established theory of singular integrals in Hörmander setting (due to Folland and Stein [20], Rotshild and Stein [39], Greiner and Stein [26]) allows to prove interior Schauder estimates. For more recent results we quote the Hölder estimates by Citti in [14], the Schauder estimates of Xu [44] and Capogna and Han [13] for uniformly subelliptic operators, Bramanti and Brandolini [4] for heat-type operators and the results of Lunardi [36], Di Francesco and Polidoro [16] Gutierrez and Lanconelli [28], Bramanti and Zhu [6] and Simon [41] for a large class of operators. The problem at the boundary is completely different.

1.3. **Schauder estimates at the boundary.** A smooth surface M in a Carnot group can always be locally expressed as the zero level set of a function $f \in C^\infty$ but it can have points $\bar{x} \in M$ where $\nabla f(\bar{x}) = 0$. At these points, called characteristic, the geometry of the surface is not completely understood. Far from characteristic points, properties of regular surfaces have been largely studied starting from the papers of Kohn and Nirenberg in [33], Jerison in [30] and more recently by Franchi, Serapioni and Serra Cassano, [21, 22] (see also the references therein). The stratification defined in (1.1) induces a stratification on the tangent plane of the manifold M. We will call $\hat{V}^1 = V^1 \cap TM$, $\hat{V}^2 = V^2 \cap TM$, $\cdots$, $\hat{V}^\kappa = V^\kappa \cap TM$, and $\left\{\hat{X}_i\right\}_{i=1,\cdots,m}$ a basis of $\hat{V}^1$. We also require that the following condition holds:

$$Lie(\hat{V}^1, \cdots, \hat{V}^\kappa) = TM. \tag{1.5}$$

Under this assumption the manifold M has a Hörmander structure, hence a distance $\hat{d}$ and corresponding classes of Hölder continuous functions $\hat{C}^{k,\alpha}(M)$ are well defined. For every choice of regular coefficients $(b_i)_{i=2,\cdots,m}$, a Laplace-type operator

$$\hat{\Delta} = \sum_{i=2}^{m} \hat{X}_i^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{m} b_i \hat{X}_i \tag{1.6}$$

is defined on M, with fundamental solution $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$.

It has been proved by Kohn and Nirenberg in [33] that, if D is a smooth open set with smooth boundary and g a smooth function defined on the boundary of D, the problem

$$\Delta u = 0 \text{ in } D, \quad u = g \text{ on } \partial D \tag{1.7}$$

has a unique solution, that is C^∞ up to the boundary at non characteristic points. In the characteristic points, up to now, very few results are known (see [31], already quoted, see also e.g. [12], [24] and [43] where, with suitable geometric assumptions on the domain, non tangential limits up to the boundary are established). In this paper we prove the exact analogous of the classical Schauder estimates at the boundary, providing estimates of the $\hat{C}^{2,\alpha}$ norm of the solution in terms of the Hölder norm of the data. Precisely our result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{G}$ be a smooth, bounded domain and assume that the vector fields $\{X_i\}_{i=1,\cdots,m}$ satisfy the assumption (1.5). Denote u the unique solution to*

$$\Delta u = f \text{ in } D, \quad u = g \text{ on } \partial D,$$

where $f \in C^\alpha(\bar{D})$ and $g \in \hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)$ and $\alpha > 0$. If $\bar{x} \in \partial D$ and V is an open neighborhood of $\bar{x}$ without characteristic points, for every $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(V)$ we have $\varphi u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{D} \cap V)$ and

$$\|\varphi u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{D}\cap V)} \leq C(\|g\|_{\hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{D})}). \tag{1.8}$$

As we mentioned before, up to now subriemannian boundary Schauder estimates are known only for the Heisenberg group (see [30]) and are based on the construction of a Poisson kernel. If D is an open bounded set, and V is a neighborhood of a non characteristic point $\overline{x} \in \partial D$, we say that $P : C^\infty(\partial D \cap V) \to C^\infty(V \cap \overline{D})$ is a local Poisson operator for the problem (1.7) if, for every $g \in C^\infty(\partial D \cap V)$, the function $u = P(g)$ satisfies $\Delta u = 0$ in $D \cap V$ and $u(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in \partial D \cap V$.

The construction of the Poisson kernel contained in [30] is based on the standard Fourier transform and can not be directly repeated in general Lie groups. General measure theory ensures the existence of a Poisson kernel under very weak assumptions on the vector fields (see for example Lanconelli and Uguzzoni [34]), but this theory only allows to establish L^p regularity of the solution at the boundary. A Poisson kernel has been built by Ferrari and Franchi [18] in the special case when the set D is a half space of the form $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \hat{\mathbb{G}}$. In this case, as well as in the Heisenberg groups considered in [30], assumption (1.5) is satisfied. However, this assumption is verified by a much larger class of Carnot groups, where the splitting of $\mathbb{G}$ is not possible. A simple example can be the following one:

$$X_1 = \partial_1, \quad X_2 = \partial_2 + x_1^2\partial_5 + x_3\partial_4, \quad X_3 = \partial_3 + x_4\partial_5. \tag{1.9}$$

Our construction of the Poisson operator is completely new and it is based on the knowledge of a smooth fundamental solution, its restriction to the boundary, and on the properties of singular integrals. Since our result is local, it is not restrictive to assume that ∂D it is a plane. In this case we will obtain the following expression of the Poisson kernel (see Theorem 5.1 for a more precise statement).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $D = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : x_1 > 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a non characteristic half space and let $g \in C^\infty(\partial D)$. Let $\bar{x} \in \partial D$, let V_0 be a neighborhood of $\bar{x}$ and let*

$$K_1(g)(\hat{y}) := \int_{\partial D \cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))\hat{\Delta} g(\hat{z})d\hat{z}. \tag{1.10}$$

There exists a lower order kernel R of degree smaller than 2 with respect to the distance $\hat{d}$, such that for every neighborhood V of $\bar{x}$, $V \subset\subset V_0$, the operator

$$P(g)(x) := \int_{\partial D \cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{y}))(K_1 + R)(g)(\hat{y})d\hat{y} \tag{1.11}$$

is a Poisson kernel in V.

The representation (1.11) and the properties of the fundamental solution immediately ensure that $P(g)$ satisfies the equation in (1.7). In order to show that P is a Poisson operator, we only have to show that $P(g)$ attains the boundary datum. This is equivalent to say that $K_1 + R$ is the inverse operator of the operator $E_{\Gamma_\Delta(0,\cdot)}$ associated to the fundamental solution $\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z}))$ restricted to ∂D.

Under the assumption (1.5) we will find the inverse of $E_{\Gamma_\Delta(0,\cdot)}$ using the fundamental solution $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$ of the operator $\hat{\Delta}$ defined in (1.6). Indeed $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$ can be expressed as follows:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $D = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : x_1 > 0\} \subset \mathbb{G}$ be a non characteristic half plane. If $\bar{x} \in \partial D$, then there exists a neighborhood V of $\bar{x}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the fundamental solution admits the following representation:*

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) = \int_{\partial D \cap V} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z}))\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y}))d\hat{z} + \hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}), \tag{1.12}$$

for every $x = (0,\hat{x}), y = (0,\hat{y}) \in \partial D \cap V$, where $\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}$ is a kernel of type strictly less than 2 with respect to the distance $\hat{d}$.

This theorem and the properties of the fundamental solution ensure that K_1 is the inverse of the operator $E_{\Gamma_\Delta(0,\cdot)}$ concluding the proof of Theorem 1.2.

The expression of Theorem 1.3 is inspired from one side by the result of Jerison in [30], from the other side by the diffusion driven results by [17] of Evans (in the Euclidean setting) and by [11] of Capogna, Citti and Senni (in Carnot groups), where a first relation between the fundamental solution on the whole space, its restriction to the boundary and the tangential Laplacian - which is the curvature operator - is established. At the same time, this theorem is strictly related to the results of Caffarelli and Silvestre [7] since it expresses $E_{\Gamma_\Delta(0,\cdot)}$ as the square root of the operator associated to $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$.

Let us explicitly note that in principle the operator $E_{\Gamma_\Delta(0,\cdot)}$ could have an inverse even in absence of assumption (1.5), opening the possibility to apply our technique for a much larger class of operators.

1.4. **Sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.3.** We conclude the introduction with a short sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.3, which is the most technical part of the paper. We will need a Riemannian approximation and a parabolic regularization of the operator Δ. Precisely the Riemannian approximation of the Laplace type operator Δ is an operator of the form

$$\Delta_\varepsilon = \Delta + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} X_i^2,$$

and its parabolic regularization leads to the operator

$$L_\varepsilon := \partial_t - \Delta_\varepsilon. \tag{1.13}$$

In a neighborhood of any non characteristic point z of ∂D (which in this case is a plane), we will apply a new version of the freezing and parametrix methods to approximate the fundamental solution Γ_ε of L_ε in terms of the fundamental solution $\hat{\Gamma}_\varepsilon$ of a suitable tangential heat operator $\partial_t - \hat{\Delta}_\varepsilon$. The parametrix method has already been largely used in the subriemannian setting for estimating the fundamental solution in terms of a known one (see for example [39, 40, 32, 14, 2]). Here we are inspired by the paper [11] where the relation between the fundamental solution on the whole space and its restriction to the boundary was studied in the framework of a diffusion driven motion by curvature. The main technical difficulty in our setting is due to the fact that neither the geometry of the space nor the structure of the operators is naturally represented as the direct sum of the tangential and the normal part. Hence we need to introduce a non homogeneous version of the parametrix method, which leads to the expression:

$$\Gamma_\varepsilon((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{y},\tau)) = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_\varepsilon((\hat{x},t),(\hat{y},\tau))}{\sqrt{t-\tau}} + O(\Gamma_\varepsilon((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{y},\tau))(t-\tau)^{1/4}) \tag{1.14}$$

for every $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y} \in \partial D$, (see also Proposition 3.12 below). The proof is quite delicate, since the space is not even locally homogeneous, as in [32], but we need to use an interplay between the Riemannian and subriemmannian nature of our operators. From this we obtain the parabolic analogous of (1.12) and, integrating in the time variable, we will deduce the thesis of Theorem 1.3.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains the principal notations and known results about Carnot groups and the Riemannian approximation method. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of equality (1.14) and its subriemannian counterpart. Section 4 concerns the proof to Theorem 1.3 and its extensions to more general vector fields and operators (see Theorem 4.5). Finally, Section 5 contains the construction of the Poisson kernel, the proof of Theorem 1.2 and the proof of the main result presented in Theorem 1.1.

2. Notations and known results

2.1. **The subriemannian structure.** As recalled in Section 1.2, a Carnot group $\mathbb{G}$ is $\mathbb{R}^n$, with the group low induced by the exponential map and the stratification $V^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V^\kappa$ of the tangent space recalled in (1.1). The stratification induces a natural notion of degree of a vector field:

$$deg(X) = j \quad \text{whenever } X \in V^j. \tag{2.1}$$

If $\{X_i\}_{i=1,\cdots,n}$ is the stratified basis introduced in subsection 1.2, we will write also $deg(i)$ instead of $deg(X_i)$. Via the exponential map, $\mathbb{R}^n$is endowed with a Lie group structure and the resulting group is denoted by $\mathbb{G}$. Since in this setting the exponential map around a fixed point y is a global diffeomorphism, every other point x can be univocally represented as $x = \exp(v_1 X_1)\exp(\sum_{i=2}^n v_i X_i)(y)$. Consequently we can define a logaritmic function $\Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y}$ as the inverse of the exponential map:

$$\Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y} : \mathbb{G} \to \mathfrak{g}, \quad \Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y}(x) = (v_1, \cdots, v_n). \tag{2.2}$$

We will simply denote Θ_y instead of $\Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y}$ when no ambiguity may arise. Note that we are using exponential canonical coordinates of second type around a fixed point $y \in \mathbb{G}$, which will simplify notations while dealing with a boundary problem.

In particular, the fixed point y around which we choose the axes has coordinates 0, the vector field X_1 is represented as $X_1 = \partial_1$ and all the others vector fields $(X_i)_{i\geq 2}$ coincide with the partial derivative ∂_i at the fixed point $y = 0$. In any other point they can be represented in these coordinates as

$$X_1 = \partial_1 \quad X_i = \partial_i + \sum_{deg(j)>deg(i)} a_{ij}(v)\partial_j \quad i = 2, \cdots, n, \tag{2.3}$$

where a_{ij} are homogeneous polynomials of degree $deg(j) - deg(i)$ depending only on variables v_h, with $deg(h) \leq deg(j) - deg(i)$ (see for example [39] for a detailed proof). Notice that if $deg(i) = \kappa$ then $X_i = \partial_i$.

By construction the vectors $\{X_i\}_{i=1,\cdots,m}$ and their commutators span $\mathfrak{g}$ at every point, and consequently verify Hörmander's finite rank condition ([29]). Due to the stratification of the algebra, a natural family of dilation $(\delta_\lambda)_{\lambda>0}$ acts on points $v = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i X_i \in \mathfrak{g}$ as follows:

$$\delta_\lambda(v) := \lambda^{deg(i)} v_i \tag{2.4}$$

and an associated homogeneous norm can be defined as follows:

$$\|v\| := \sum_{i=1}^{n} |v_i|^{1/deg(i)}. \tag{2.5}$$

Via the logarithmic function defined in (2.2) the dilation δ_λ induces a one-parameter group of automorphisms on $\mathbb{G}$, again denoted by δ_λ. A function $f : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called homogeneous of degree α if $f(\delta_\lambda(x)) = \lambda^\alpha f(x)$ for any $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{G}$. In particular we can define a gauge distance $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ homogeneous of degree 1, as the image of the norm through the function Θ, i.e.,

$$d(y, x) := \|\Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y}(x)\|. \tag{2.6}$$

The gauge function is a homogeneous function, homogeneous of order

$$Q := \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} i\, dim(V^i) \tag{2.7}$$

with respect to the dilation. Hence Q is called the homogeneous dimension of the space and there exist constant C_1, C_2 such that

$$C_1 r^Q \leq |B(x, r)| \leq C_2 r^Q \qquad \forall\, r > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{G},$$

where $B(x, r)$ denotes the metric ball centered in x with radius r, and by $|\ \cdot\ |$ we denote its Lebesgue measure.

Any vector field X will be identified with the first order differential operator with its same coefficients. If φ is a continuous function defined in an open set V of $\mathbb{G}$ and for every $i = 1 \cdots n$ there exists the Lie derivative $X_i\varphi$ we will call horizontal gradient of φ the vector

$$\nabla\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (X_i\varphi) X_i. \tag{2.8}$$

The associated classes of Hölder continuous functions will be defined as follows:

Definition 2.1. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$, $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, and u be a function defined on V. We say that $u \in C^\alpha(V)$ if there exists a positive constant M such that for every $x, x_0 \in V$*

$$|u(x) - u(x_0)| \leq M d^\alpha(x, x_0). \tag{2.9}$$

We put

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(V)} = \sup_{x \neq x_0} \frac{|u(x) - u(x_0)|}{d^\alpha(x, x_0)} + \sup_V |u|.$$

Iterating this definition, if $k \geq 1$ we say that $u \in C^{k,\alpha}(V)$ if $X_i u \in C^{k-1,\alpha}(V)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

The Laplace type operator defined in (1.2) is a differential operator of degree 2, in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 2.2. *Let $\{X_{i_j}\}$ be differential operators of order 1 and degree $deg(X_{i_j})$. We say that the differential operator $Y_1 = X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_p}$ has order p and degree $\sum_{j=1}^{p} deg(X_{i_j})$. Moreover, if Y is a differential operator represented as*

$$Y = aY_1, \tag{2.10}$$

where a is a homogeneous function of degree α, then we say that Y is homogeneous of degree $deg(Y_1) - \alpha$. A differential operator will be called of degree $k - \alpha$ if it is a sum of operators as above with maximum degree $k - \alpha$.

Following [19] we recall the definition of kernel of type α:

Definition 2.3. *We say that K is a kernel of type α, if K is of class C^∞ away from 0 and it is homogeneous of degree $\alpha - Q$.*

In a Carnot group, this implies that the condition (1.4) is satisfied.

2.2. **The Riemannian approximation of the structure.** One of the key technical instruments that we will use is a Riemannian approximation of the subriemannian structure.

For all $\varepsilon > 0$, we define a family of left invariant Riemannian metrics in $\mathfrak{g}$ by requesting that

$$(X_{1,\varepsilon}, \cdots, X_{n,\varepsilon}) := (X_1, \cdots, X_m, \varepsilon^{deg(m+1)-1} X_{m+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon^{deg(n)-1} X_n) \tag{2.11}$$

is an orthonormal frame. We say that these vector fields have ε-degree equal to 1, and we write $deg_\varepsilon(X_{i,\varepsilon}) = 1$. Since the Lie algebra generated by these vectors also contains the commutators of these vector fields, we also consider the vector fields

$$X_{i,\varepsilon} := X_{i-n+m} \text{ and } \ deg_\varepsilon(X_{i,\varepsilon}) := deg(X_{i-n+m}) \text{ for all } i = n+1, \cdots, 2n-m. \tag{2.12}$$

Let d_{cc} and $d_{cc,\varepsilon}$ denote the control distances associated with the vector fields $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ and $X_{1,\varepsilon}, \cdots, X_{n,\varepsilon}$, respectively. It is well known (see for instance [27] and the references therein) that $(\mathbb{G}, d_{cc,\varepsilon})$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, to the subriemannian space $(\mathbb{G}, d_{cc})$. Although the subriemannian structure is formally recovered in the limit for $\varepsilon \to 0$, we will need to recognize that the structure and all constants appearing in the estimates are stable in the limit. In addition we will need to recognize that the space has a property of ε-homogeneity, with respect to the natural distance.

A classical estimate of the distance $d_{cc,\varepsilon}$ is due to Nagel, Stein and Wainger in [38]. From the whole family $\{X_{i,\varepsilon}\}_{i=1,\cdots,2n-m}$ it is possible to select different bases $\{X_{i_j,\varepsilon}\}_{i_j \in I}$, for different choices of indices $I = (i_1, \cdots i_n) \subset \{1, ..., 2n-m\}$. As a consequence each vector v has different representations $v = \sum_{i_j \in I} v_{i_j,\varepsilon} X_{i_j,\varepsilon}$ in terms of the different bases. The optimal choice of indices, denoted $I_{v,\varepsilon}$, is the one which minimize the ε-homogeneous gauge distance:

$$\|v\|_\varepsilon = \sum_{i_j \in I_{v,\varepsilon}} |v_{i_j,\varepsilon}|^{1/deg_\varepsilon(i_j)} = \min_I \sum_{i_j \in I} |v_{i_j,\varepsilon}|^{1/deg_\varepsilon(i_j)}. \tag{2.13}$$

This norm can be explicitly written as follows: if $v = \Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y}(x)$ then

$$\|v\|_\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v_i| + \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} \min\left\{ \frac{|v_i|}{\varepsilon^{deg(i)-1}}, |v_i|^{1/deg(i)} \right\}. \tag{2.14}$$

In [10] it is proved that the associated ball box distance

$$d_\varepsilon(y,x) = \|\Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,y}(x)\|_\varepsilon. \tag{2.15}$$

is locally equivalent to the distance $d_{cc,\varepsilon}$, with equivalence constants independent of ε. Let us explicitly note that this distance has different behavior in 0 and at infinity. Indeed, if v_i are small with respect to ε for every $i \geq m+1$, then the distance d_ε has a Riemannian behavior, while it is purely subriemannian for v_i large.

If we denote by $B_\varepsilon(x,r)$ the ball $\{y \in \mathbb{G} \,|\, d_\varepsilon(x,y) < r\}$, by $|\Omega|$ the Lebesgue measure of a subset Ω, then it has recently proved in [10] the following uniform doubling property.

Proposition 2.4. *There is a constant C independent of ε such that for every $x \in \mathbb{G}$ and $r > 0$,*

$$|B_\varepsilon(x,2r)| \leq C|B_\varepsilon(x,r)|. \tag{2.16}$$

It is worthwhile to note that, in this framework, an analogous of (2.7) can not be written, but the doubling inequality can be considered as a weak form of that condition.

Following [39] we will give the following definition of local homogeneous functions and operators

Definition 2.5. *A function f is locally homogeneous of ε-degree α in a neighborhood of a point z with respect to the metric* (2.15) *if $f \circ \Theta^{-1}_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,z}$ is homogeneous of degree α, with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_\varepsilon$ defined in* (2.14)*. A differential operator Y is homogeneous of local ε-degree α in a neighborhood of a point z, with respect to the metric* (2.15) *if $d\Theta_{X_1,\cdots,X_n,z}(Y)$ is homogeneous of degree α.*

In particular this definition implies the following property:

Remark 2.6. *If a is a homogeneous function of ε-degree α and Y_1 is an operator of ε-degree k, then $a(z^{-1}x)Y_1$ is a homogeneous operator of ε-degree $k-\alpha$. This implies that for every other smooth function f of local ε-degree β in a neighborhood of a point z, $a(z^{-1}x)(Y_1 f)$ is a smooth function of ε-degree $\beta+\alpha-k$ in a neighborhood of a point z, and $|a(z^{-1}x)(Y_1 f)(z^{-1}x)| \leq C d_\varepsilon^{\beta+\alpha-k}(x,z)$.*

If $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$ we define the ε-gradient of φ as follows

$$\nabla_\varepsilon \varphi := \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_{i,\varepsilon}\varphi) X_{i,\varepsilon}.$$

In terms of the vector fields with ε-degree 1, defined in (2.11), we consider the associated heat operator

$$L_\varepsilon := \partial_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i,\varepsilon}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i X_{i,\varepsilon}. \tag{2.17}$$

In analogy with the operator introduced in (2.8), the heat operator associated to the subriemannian structure has the form

$$L := \partial_t - \sum_{i=1}^{m} X_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i X_i. \tag{2.18}$$

The behavior of these operators in interior points is well known: they admit fundamental solutions respectively $\Gamma_\varepsilon(x,t)$ and $\Gamma(x,t)$ of class C^∞ out of the pole (see [32] for precise estimates of $\Gamma(x,t)$ and [9] for estimates of $\Gamma_\varepsilon(x,t)$ uniform in ε).

In our work we will need estimates which are uniform in the variable ε. We start with the following definition.

Definition 2.7. *We say that a family of kernels $(P_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$, defined on $\mathbb{G}\times]0,\infty[\times\mathbb{G}\times]0,\infty[$ and C^∞ out of the diagonal, is of uniform exponential ε-type $\lambda+2$, if for $q\in\mathbb{N}$ and k-tuple $(i_1,\dots,i_k)\in\{1,\dots,n\}^k$ there exists $C_{q,k}>0$, depending only on $k,q,\mathbb{G}$ and on the subriemannian metric, such that*

$$|(X_{i_1,\varepsilon}\cdots X_{i_k,\varepsilon}\partial_t^q P_\varepsilon)((x,t),(z,\tau))| \le C_{q,k}(t-\tau)^{-q-k/2+\lambda/2}\frac{e^{-\frac{d_\varepsilon(x,z)^2}{C_{q,k}(t-\tau)}}}{|B_\varepsilon(x,\sqrt{t-\tau})|} \tag{2.19}$$

for all $x\in\mathbb{G}$ and $t>\tau$.

According with the definition above, the fundamental solution Γ_ε is a kernel of exponential ε-type 2. Precisely, the following result, established by [8] (see also [15] and [9]), holds:

Theorem 2.8. *The fundamental solution $\Gamma_\varepsilon(x,t)$ of the operator L_ε is a kernel of exponential ε-type 2 such that there exist constants $C_0, C>0$ independent of ε such that for each $\varepsilon>0$, $x\in\mathbb{G}$ and $t>\tau$ one has*

$$C_0^{-1}\frac{e^{-C\frac{d_\varepsilon(x,z)^2}{(t-\tau)}}}{|B_\varepsilon(x,\sqrt{t-\tau})|} \le \Gamma_\varepsilon((x,t),(z,\tau)) \le C_0\frac{e^{-\frac{d_\varepsilon(x,z)^2}{C(t-\tau)}}}{|B_\varepsilon(x,\sqrt{t-\tau})|}. \tag{2.20}$$

Moreover, for any k-tuple $(i_1,\dots,i_k)\in\{1,\dots,m\}^k$ one has

$$X_{i_1}\cdots X_{i_k}\partial_t^q\Gamma_\varepsilon \to X_{i_1}\cdots X_{i_k}\partial_t^q\Gamma \quad \text{as } \varepsilon\to 0 \tag{2.21}$$

uniformly on compact sets and in a dominated way on all $\mathbb{G}$.

2.3. **The parametrix method.** One of the main instruments that we will use to estimate the fundamental solution is the parametrix method, originally due to Levi and now extremely classical for elliptic and parabolic equations (see [23]). In subriemannian setting the parametrix method have been used to approximate general Hörmander type operators with homogeneous ones: we refer to [39, 40] for the first results, [32] for the subriemannian heat kernel, [14] for estimates in case of low regularity, [2] for a recent selfcontained presentation. The method consists in providing an explicit representation of the fundamental solution Γ of an operator L in terms of the fundamental solution of an

approximating operator L_{z_1} (with associated fundamental solution Γ_{z_1}). Using the definition of fundamental solution and the fact that $L_{z_1}(\Gamma - \Gamma_{z_1}) = (L_{z_1} - L)\Gamma$, the difference between the two solutions can be formally represented as

$$(\Gamma - \Gamma_{z_1})((x,t),(z,\tau)) = \int \Gamma_{z_1}((x,t),(y,\theta))(L_{z_1} - L)(\Gamma - \Gamma_{z_1})((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\, dy\, d\theta$$
$$+ \int \Gamma_{z_1}((x,t),(y,\theta))(L_{z_1} - L)\Gamma_{z_1}((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\, dy\, d\theta. \qquad (2.22)$$

Denoting by

$$H := L_{z_1} - L, \qquad (2.23)$$

and $E_{\Gamma_{z_1}}$ the integral operator with kernel Γ_{z_1}, the above expression (2.22) can be written as

$$(I - E_{\Gamma_{z_1}} H)(\Gamma - \Gamma_{z_1}) = E_{\Gamma_{z_1}} H(\Gamma_{z_1}).$$

If the operator $(I - E_{\Gamma_{z_1}} H)$ is invertible, the difference $\Gamma - \Gamma_{z_1}$ can be formally expressed as

$$\Gamma - \Gamma_{z_1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (E_{\Gamma_{z_1}} H)^{j+1}(\Gamma_{z_1}) = E_{\Gamma_{z_1}} \Phi, \quad \text{with } \Phi := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (H E_{\Gamma_{z_1}})^j H(\Gamma_{z_1}). \qquad (2.24)$$

Roughly speaking the proof is obtained as follows:

1) The first and most delicate part of the proof is to define the approximating operator H and to prove that it is a differential operator of degree $2 - \alpha$ for a suitable positive α. From this fact it follows that the kernel
$$R_1(x,z) := H\Gamma_{z_1}(x,z) \qquad (2.25)$$
is homogeneous of type α with respect to the considered homogeneous space. It is important to note that
$$R_1(x,z) = (L_{z_1} - L)\Gamma_{z_1}(x,z) = L(\Gamma(x,z) - \Gamma_{z_1}(x,z)).$$
2) Identifying the operator $H E_{\Gamma_{z_1}}$ with the integral operator E_{R_1} with kernel R_1, the series Φ in (2.24) reduces to
$$\Phi = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (E_{R_1})^j E_{R_1}. \qquad (2.26)$$
Using the fact that the convolution of a kernel of type α with a kernel of type β provides a kernel of type $\alpha + \beta$, it is possible to prove that this series converges uniformly (see for example Lemma 7.3 in [30]).
3) Finally, singular integrals tools lead to the convergence of the derivatives and the function Γ, defined through (2.24), is a fundamental solution.

In the sequel we will consider kernels of type α in the sense of Definition 2.3, when working with subelliptic operators, while kernels of exponential ε-type α in the sense of Definition 2.7, when studying Riemannian heat kernels. The main difficulty to be faced here is that the Riemannian approximation has not a standard notion of homogeneity,

since the Riemannian homogeneous dimension n collapses to the subriemannian one Q in the limit. However we have endowed the regularized space with an ε-homogeneous structure (see (2.16) and the remark below) and we will see that this is enough to apply the method in this setting. Therefore, even though our vector fields are homogeneous, our approach is more similar to the ones [39, 40, 32, 14] where the geometry of the given operator and the approximating one do not coincide.

3. Heat and Laplace kernels on a plane

Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a Carnot group of step κ. Consider a non characteristic plane $M_0 = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} : x_1 = 0\}$, where $x = (x_1, \hat{x})$ is a point of the space, $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. It is not restrictive to assume that the choice of the vector fields has been made in such a way that $X_1 = \partial_1$ coincides with the direction normal to the plane, while all other vector fields $\{X_i\}_{i=2,\cdots,n}$ are tangent and are represented as in (2.3). Thanks to this choice, not only the plane M_0 is non characteristic, but also the planes $M_{z_1} = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} : x_1 = z_1\}$, for every z_1 sufficiently small, are non characteristic. We stress also that assumption (1.5) ensures that the vector fields obtained by evaluating the coefficients a_{ij} on the points of the plane M_0, i.e.

$$X_{i,0} := X_{i|x_1=0}, \quad i = 2, \cdots, n, \tag{3.1}$$

satisfy a Hörmander condition and span a $n-1$ dimensional space at every point. Consequently a Laplace operator on M_0 and its time dependent counterpart will be expressed as

$$\hat{\Delta} := \sum_{i=2}^{m} X_{i,0}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{L} := \partial_t - \hat{\Delta}, \tag{3.2}$$

respectively and they have non negative fundamental solutions $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}$ respectively. Our first result is the following one:

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $M_0 = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} : x_1 = 0\}$ is a non characteristic plane and let $T > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(T)$ such that for all $z = (0, \hat{z})$, $x = (0, \hat{x})$ in M_0 and for every t and τ, with $0 < t - \tau < T$, we have*

$$|\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x}, t), (\hat{z}, \tau)) - \sqrt{t-\tau}\Gamma((x, t), (z, \tau))| \leq C\Gamma((x, t), (z, \tau))(t-\tau)^{3/4}. \tag{3.3}$$

This theorem will be proved with the parametrix method and a Riemannian approximation. Classically, the method is applied for proving the existence of the fundamental solution of a given operator. Extending an approch of [11], we apply here the method to find a relation between the operator L, defined in (2.18) and its tangential part $\hat{L}$, defined in (3.2).

Even though the parametrix method has been largely used in the subriemannian setting for internal estimates, the vector fields $X_{i,0}$ do not provide a subriemannian approximation of the vector fields X_i and the standard parametrix method of Rothschild and Stein can not be applied starting with the fundamental solution of $L_0 := \partial_t - \sum_i X_{i,0}^2$. In order to clarify this fact we start with the concrete example of vector fields already introduced in (1.9).

Example 3.2. *Let us consider the vector fields in* (1.9)*. Their commutators are* $\partial_4 = [X_1, X_2]$*, which is a vector field of degree* 2*, and* $\partial_5 = [[X_1, X_2], X_2]$*, which is a vector field of degree* 3*.*

If we evaluate the vector fields X_i *on the plane* $\{x_1 = 0\}$ *we obtain*

$$X_{2,0} = \partial_2 + x_3\partial_4, \quad X_{3,0} = \partial_3 + x_4\partial_5,$$

so that

$$X_2 - X_{2,0} = x_1^2\partial_5 \text{ is an operator of degree } 1.$$

Consequently, the difference

$$H = L_0 - L \text{ is an operator of degree } 2.$$

Hence it is not possible to apply the parametrix method, whose convergence requires H *to be an operator of degree strictly less than* 2*.*

Due to these difficulties, we introduce a new version of the parametrix method, using the ε-Riemannian approximation described in the Introduction. We will introduced below vector fields $\{X_{i,0,\varepsilon}\}_{i=1,\cdots,m}$ such that the difference $(X_{i,0,\varepsilon} - X_{i,\varepsilon})_{i=1,\cdots,m}$ is an operator of ε-degree $1/2$ in an ε-neighborhood of the plane and this enables us to apply the parametrix method. The whole proof is based on a careful analysis of the Riemannian approximation metric and lies on a delicate interplay between the Riemannian and subriemmannian nature of our operators.

3.1. **Choice of an approximating operator.** In the previous section we have chosen a point 0 of the non characteristic plane M_0, and we noted that for ϵ sufficiently small for every $z_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $|z_1| \leq \varepsilon^{2\kappa}$, the plane $M_{z_1} = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} : x_1 = z_1\}$ is non-characteristic. In analogy with (3.1), we define the vector fields

$$X_{1,z_1} := \partial_1, \quad X_{i,z_1} := X_{i|_{x_1=z_1}} = \partial_i + \sum_{deg(j)>deg(i)} a_{ij}(z_1, \hat{x})\partial_j, \quad i = 2, \cdots, n \tag{3.4}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and we set

$$X_{1,z_1,\varepsilon} := \partial_1, \quad X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon} := X_{i,\varepsilon|_{x_1=z_1}}, \quad i = 2, \cdots, n \tag{3.5}$$

In order to apply the parametrix method, we introduce now an operator $L_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ which can be splitted in a tangential and in a normal part on any plane M_{z_1}. Precisely, we define

$$L_{z_1,\varepsilon} := \partial_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}^2 \tag{3.6}$$

with fundamental solution $\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ on the whole space. On every plane M_{z_1} we define the tangential operators

$$\hat{L}_{z_1,\varepsilon} := \partial_t - \hat{\Delta}_{z_1,\varepsilon}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \hat{\Delta}_{z_1,\varepsilon} := \sum_{i=2}^{n} X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}^2, \tag{3.7}$$

with non negative fundamental solutions $\hat{\Gamma}_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta,z_1,\varepsilon}$ respectively.

Remark 3.3. *Let us explicitly note that the operator $L_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ can be represented as*

$$L_{z_1,\varepsilon} = \partial_t - \partial_{11}^2 - \hat{\Delta}_{z_1,\varepsilon}.$$

Since ∂_1 coincides with the direction normal to the plane, the operator splits in the sum of its orthogonal part $\partial_t - \partial_{11}^2$ and its tangential part $\hat{L}_{z_1,\varepsilon}$. Consequently its fundamental solution can be represented as

$$\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon} = \Gamma_{\perp,z_1,\varepsilon}\hat{\Gamma}_{z_1,\varepsilon}.$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ is defined above and $\Gamma_{\perp,z_1,\varepsilon}$ is the standard one-dimensional Gaussian function, fundamental solution of $\partial_t - \partial_{11}^2$.

3.2. **Estimates of the approximating operator.** As recalled in Section 2.3 the first step of the parametrix method is to prove that the difference $X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$ is a differential operator of ε-degree strictly less than 1 around the point z_1 and, as a consequence, that the operator $H_\varepsilon := L_\varepsilon - L_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ (see also (2.23) above) has ε-degree strictly less than 2.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $M_{z_1} = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} : x_1 = z_1\}$ be a non characteristic plane. For every $z = (z_1, \hat{z}) \in M_{z_1}$, and for every $i \le n$ and for every h such that $deg(i) + 1 \le deg(h) \le \kappa$ there exists a polynomial $b_{i,h,z_1}(v)$, homogeneous of degree $deg(h) - deg(i) - 1$ as a function of v and z_1, such that, if $v = \Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(x)$,*

$$d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_i - X_{i,z_1}) = v_1 \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} b_{i,h,z_1}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1}), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}$ has been defined in (2.2). Moreover

$$|b_{i,h,z_1}(v)| \le C \sum_{j=0}^{deg(h)-deg(i)-1} |z_1|^j \|v\|^{deg(h)-deg(i)-1-j}. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. When $i = 1, \cdots, n$, by the definition (2.3) and (3.5) of the vector fields we have, for $deg(i) = \kappa$

$$X_i - X_{i,z_1} = 0, \tag{3.10}$$

hence the thesis is true, and we have to prove it only for $deg(i) < \kappa$. Using the fact that the translation associated to the vector fields X_{z_1} acts only on the $\hat{x}$ variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_i - X_{i,z_1}) &= \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} \Big(a_{i,h}(x_1, \hat{v}) - a_{i,h}(z_1, \hat{v})\Big)\partial_h = \\ &= \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} (x_1 - z_1) a^1_{i,h,z_1}(v)\partial_h. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

In the last equality we have denoted $(x_1 - z_1)a^1_{i,h,z_1}(v)$ the polynomial $a_{i,h}(x_1, \hat{v}) - a_{i,h}(z_1, \hat{v})$. The polynomial $a^1_{i,h,z_1}(v)$ is homogeneous of degree $deg(h) - deg(i) - 1$ in the variables v and z_1 and can be estimated as

$$|a_{i,h}(x_1, \hat{v}) - a_{i,h}(z_1, \hat{v})| \le C \sum_{j=0}^{deg(h)-deg(i)-1} |z_1|^j \|v\|^{deg(h)-deg(i)-1-j}.$$

Also note that $v_1 = x_1 - z_1$.

If $deg(i) = \kappa - 1$, the proof is completed, by (3.10). For $deg(i) < \kappa - 1$, using again the expression (3.5) for $h < \kappa$ and (3.10) for $h = \kappa$, we get, recalling (3.4)

$$d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_i - X_{i,z_1}) = v_1 \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} a^1_{i,h,z}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1}) -$$

$$-v_1 \sum_{deg(j)=deg(i)+2}^{\kappa} \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{deg(j)-1} a^1_{i,h,z}(v) a_{h,j,z}(v) \partial_{v_j}.$$

Since the Lie group is nilpotent of step κ, after $\kappa - 1$ iteration of this method, we get that there exists a polynomial b_{i,h,z_1} such that (3.12) is satisfied. □

From this lemma, Corollary 3.5 immediately follows. The proof is technically very simple, but it is important to note that the $X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$ is a differential operator of local degree 1 and local ε-degree $1/2$ in a neighborhood of the point z. This property allows to obtain a better approximation in the Riemannian setting, rather than in the subriemannian setting.

Corollary 3.5. *Let M_0 be a non characteristic plane. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the strip*

$$\mathcal{S} := \{x = (x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} : |x_1| \leq \varepsilon^{2\kappa},\ |x_1 - z_1| \leq \varepsilon^{2\kappa}\},$$

where κ is the step of the group. Then $X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$ is a differential operator of ε-degree $1/2$ with respect to the vector fields $X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$.

Proof. Applying Lemma 3.4 and calling $p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) = \varepsilon^{-deg(h)} v_1 b_{i,h,z_1}(v)$ we have

$$|p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \leq C|v_1|^{1/2} \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} \sum_{j=0}^{deg(h)-deg(i)-1} \|v\|^{deg(h)-deg(i)-1-j},$$

and

$$d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}) = \varepsilon^{deg(i)} \sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}). \tag{3.12}$$

If $\|v\| \leq 1$, then $|p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \leq C|v_1|^{1/2}$. Since $X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}$ has degree 1, then $p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon})$ is a differential operator of local ε-degree $1/2$ in the set $\|v\| \leq 1$ with respect to the vector fields $X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$.

On the other side, if $\|v\| \geq 1$, we have that X_{h,z_1} is a differential operator of ε-degree h, $|p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \leq C|v_1|^{1/2}\|v\|^{deg(h)}$, so that

$$p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}) = \varepsilon^{deg(h)} p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1})$$

is a differential operator of ε-degree $1/2$ for $\|v\| \geq 1$ with respect to the vector fields $X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$. □

As a direct consequence of the previous corollary, we can prove that the difference $H_\varepsilon = L_\varepsilon - L_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ is a differential operator of degree strictly less than 2 in a neighborhood of the point z.

Lemma 3.6. *Under the assumptions of Corollary 3.5, $L_\varepsilon - L_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ is an operator of ε-degree $3/2$ with respect to the vector fields $X_{z_1,\varepsilon}$. Precisely there exist polynomials $p^{(1)}_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}$, $p^{(2)}_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}$ and a constant C independent of ε satisfying*

$$|p^{(1)}_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \le C|v_1|^{1/2} \ \text{ for } \|v\| \le 1, \quad |p^{(1)}_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \le C|v_1|^{1/2}\|v\|^{deg(h)} \ \text{ for } \|v\| \ge 1$$

and

$$|p^{(2)}_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \le C|v_1|^{1/2} \ \text{ for } \|v\| \le 1, \quad |p^{(2)}_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v)| \le C|v_1|^{1/2}\|v\|^{deg(h)+deg(i)} \ \text{ for } \|v\| \ge 1,$$

such that

$$d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(L_\varepsilon - L_{z_1,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{deg(h)=2}^{\kappa} p^{(1)}_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}) + \tag{3.13}$$

$$+ \sum_{deg(h)=2}^{\kappa} \sum_{deg(i)=1}^{deg(h)-1} p^{(2)}_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon} X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. By the definition of the operators we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(L_\varepsilon - L_{z_1,\varepsilon}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}\Big(X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}(X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon})\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big(d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon})\Big)^2 + \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}\Big((X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}) X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}\Big) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,\varepsilon}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Let us consider the first term at the right hand side. By Corollary 3.5

$$d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,\varepsilon} - X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}) =$$

$$= d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon})\Big(\sum_{deg(h)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon})\Big).$$

When the derivative is applied on the coefficients $p_{i,h,z_1,\varepsilon}$, we obtain a term contributing to the terms $p^{(1)}_{h,z_1,\varepsilon}(v) d\Theta_{X_{z_1},z}(X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon})$. When the derivative is applied on the differential operator we obtain a contribution to the second sum in the right hand side of (3.13).

The other terms of (3.14) can be handled in a similar way.

□

In analogy with (2.25) we define the kernel

$$R_{1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau)) := (L_{z_1,\varepsilon} - L_\varepsilon)\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau)). \tag{3.15}$$

for $t > \tau$.

As a consequence of Lemma 3.6 and of the homogeneity of the fundamental solution, we provide an estimate for $R_{1,\varepsilon}$.

Lemma 3.7. *If $M_0 \subset \mathbb{G}$ is a non-characteristic plane, $R_{1,\varepsilon}$ is a family of kernels of ε-uniform exponential type $1/2$ in the set $\{|x_1| \leq \varepsilon^{2\kappa}\}$. Precisely for every bounded set there exists a constant C such that for every $x = (x_1, \hat{x})$, $z = (z_1, \hat{z}) \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $|x_1|, |z_1| \leq \varepsilon^{2\kappa}$.*

$$|R_{1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau))| \leq C \frac{\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,2t),(z,2\tau))}{|t-\tau|^{3/4}}, \tag{3.16}$$

with a constant C independent of ε and z_1.

Proof. By the representation formulas obtained in the previous Lemma 3.6, used with $v_1 = x_1 - z_1$, we only have to estimate terms of the type $|x_1 - z_1|^{1/2} X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon} X_{h,z_1,\varepsilon} \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau))$. Using (2.19) for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ we immediately obtain

$$|R_{1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau))| \leq C \frac{|x_1 - z_1|^{1/2} \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,2t),(z,2\tau))}{|t-\tau|}.$$

In order to prove (3.16) we note that we can assume that $|x_1 - z_1| > \sqrt{t-\tau}$, since otherwise the assertion is true. In this case we can use the fact that $\rho^{1/4} e^{-\rho^2} \leq C e^{-2\rho^2}$, for a suitable constant C, and the estimate (2.20) of the fundamental solution to ensure that

$$\frac{|x_1 - z_1|^{1/2}}{|t-\tau|^{1/4}} \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau)) \leq C \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,2t),(z,2\tau)), \tag{3.17}$$

From here the thesis follows at once.

□

3.3. **Convergence of the parametrix method.** The second step of the parametrix method consists in proving that the series Φ, defined in (2.26), is convergent. Because of the lack of homogeneity of the space we can not follow classical approaches as [39] or [23]. First, indeed, we need to to obtain a suitable reproducing formula, see Lemma 3.9. After this delicate step, we can follow the general idea of the method, and deduce the convergence of the serie Φ as in [23], [32].

Let us establish preliminarily some properties of the distances involved.

We will denote by $d_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ and $d_{z_1,0}$ the distances defined in terms of the vector fields $X_{i,z_1,\varepsilon}$ and X_{i,z_1} respectively, as in (2.15) and (2.6), i.e.

$$d_{z_1,0}(x,z) = \|\Theta_{X_{1,z_1},\cdots,X_{n,z_1},z}(x)\|, \;\; d_{z_1,\varepsilon}(x,z) = \|\Theta_{X_{1,z_1,\varepsilon},\cdots,X_{n,z_1,\varepsilon},z}(x)\|_\varepsilon. \tag{3.18}$$

Under the usual assumption that $M_0 \subset \mathbb{G}$ is a non characteristic plane (and also M_{z_1} for $|z_1|$ sufficiently small), we have the following lemmata.

Lemma 3.8. *For every $x = (x_1, \hat{x})$, $z = (z_1, \hat{z})$ in $\mathbb{G}$,*

$$d(x,z) = d_{z_1,0}(x,z), \quad d_\varepsilon(x,z) = d_{z_1,\varepsilon}(x,z). \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. By definition of d, see (2.6), in order to compute $d(x,z)$ we use the canonical coordinates of second type $v := \Theta_{X_{1,z_1},\cdots,X_{n,z_1},z}$ around the point $z=(z_1,\hat{z})$; i.e.,

$$x = \exp(v_1 X_1)\exp(\sum_{i=2}^{n} v_i X_i)(z).$$

Since all the vector fields $(X_i)_{i=2,\cdots,n}$ are tangential to the plane M_{z_1}, the integral curve $t \mapsto \exp(t\sum_{i=2}^{n} v_i X_i)(z)$ is tangent, hence the vector fields $(X_i)_{i=2,\cdots,n}$ are computed for $x_1 = z_1$. Therefore, along this curve they coincide with the vector fields X_{i,z_1}. This implies that $d(x,z) = d_{z_1,0}(x,z)$. The same argument applies to prove the second equality in (3.19). □

We can now prove our non linear reproducing formula for the fundamental solution

Lemma 3.9. *For $t>\tau$ and $x=(x_1,\hat{x})$, $z=(z_1,\hat{z})\in\mathbb{G}$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\,dy \le C\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,ct),(z,c\tau)),$$

where we have denoted $y=(y_1,\hat{y})$, and C and c are positive constants independent of ε.

Proof. We will estimate the fundamental solution, in terms of the fundamental heat kernel Γ_ε using the estimates of the distance (3.19) and the exponential estimate (2.20). Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\,dy\\
&\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\exp\Big(-\frac{Cd^2_{y_1,\varepsilon}(x,y)}{t-\theta}\Big)}{|B_{y_1,\varepsilon}(x,(t-\theta)^{1/2})|}\,\frac{\exp\Big(-\frac{Cd^2_{z_1,\varepsilon}(y,z)}{\theta-\tau}\Big)}{|B_{z_1,\varepsilon}(y,(\theta-\tau)^{1/2})|}\,dy\\
&\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\exp\Big(-\frac{Cd^2_{\varepsilon}(x,y)}{t-\theta}\Big)}{|B_{\varepsilon}(x,(t-\theta)^{1/2})|}\,\frac{\exp\Big(-\frac{Cd^2_{\varepsilon}(y,z)}{\theta-\tau}\Big)}{|B_{\varepsilon}(y,(\theta-\tau)^{1/2})|}\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can use the fact that the heat kernel Γ_ε satisfies the classical reproduction formula, so that we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\,dy\\
&\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Gamma_{\varepsilon}((x,ct),(y,c\theta))\Gamma_{\varepsilon}((y,c\theta),(z,c\tau))\,dy\\
&\le C\Gamma_\varepsilon((x,ct),(z,c\tau)) \le C\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,ct),(z,c\tau)).
\end{aligned}$$

where C,c are positive constants independent of ε that may vary from line to line. □

Since we have a good estimate of the kernel $R_{1,\varepsilon}$ only in an ε- neighborhood of the plane M_0, we have to modify the classical parametrix method, restricting the integral in this neighborhood. To this end we consider a cut-off function depending only on the first variable x_1. Precisely, we consider a piecewise function ρ_ε, supported in an ε neighborhood of the origin, defined as follows:

$$\rho_\varepsilon(x_1) = 1 \text{ if } |x_1| \le 2\varepsilon^{2\kappa}, \quad \rho_\varepsilon(x_1) = 0 \text{ elsewhere.} \tag{3.20}$$

For any suitable kernel K, we define

$$E_{R_1,\varepsilon}(K)((x,t),(z,\tau)) := -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\times[\tau,t]} R_{1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\, K((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\rho_\varepsilon(y_1-z_1)\,dyd\theta \tag{3.21}$$

and, in analogy with (2.26), we consider

$$\Phi_\varepsilon((x,t),(z,\tau)) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(E_{R_1,\varepsilon})^j(R_{1,\varepsilon})((x,t),(z,\tau)). \tag{3.22}$$

We will prove that the series can be is totally convergent on the set

$$\left\{0<t-\tau\le T,\ |x_1|,|z_1|\le\varepsilon^{2\kappa},\ d_\varepsilon(x,z)+|t-\tau|^{\frac12}\ge\delta\right\}\qquad\text{for all } T>0,\delta>0$$

and it is a kernel of uniform exponential ε-type $1/2$, i.e. it satisfies the estimate

$$|\Phi_\varepsilon((x,t),(z,\tau))|\le c(T)(t-\tau)^{-\frac34}\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,ct),(z,c\tau))\qquad 0<t-\tau\le T, \tag{3.23}$$

with constants independent of ε and of z_1.

As we mentioned in Section 2.3 the convergence of this series relies on properties of convolutions of kernels. Hence we will need the following property of the operator $E_{R_1,\varepsilon}$, that ensures that the series can be estimated by a power series, so that it is convergent on the mentioned set:

Lemma 3.10. *Let $M_0\subset\mathbb{G}$ be a non-characteristic plane. For $z\in M_0$, $x\in\mathbb{G}$, with $|x_1|\le\varepsilon^{2\kappa}$ and for $j\in\mathbb{N}$ it holds that*

$$|(E_{R_1,\varepsilon})^j R_1((x,t),(z,\tau))|\le\frac{C^j b_j}{2}\frac{\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau))}{(t-\tau)^{1-j/4}},\quad j\in\mathbb{N}, \tag{3.24}$$

where $b_j=\Gamma^j(\frac14)/\Gamma(\frac{j}{4})$ and Γ is the Euler Gamma-function.

Proof. We argue as in [32] or [2]. Here we only sketch the proof of (3.24), to show that the constant is independent of ε. The estimate is true for $j=1$ (see (3.16)). Let us assume that an analogous estimate holds for $j\in\mathbb{N}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&|(E_{R_1,\varepsilon})^{j+1}R_1((x,t),(z,\tau))|\le\\ &\le\frac{C^j b_j}{2}\int_\tau^t(t-\theta)^{-\frac34}(\theta-\tau)^{-1+\frac{j}{4}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\,dyd\theta.\end{aligned}$$

By the reproduction property in Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\,dy\le C\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}(x,t),(z,\tau))$$

and, by the change of variable $r=(t-\tau)^{-1}(\theta-\tau)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&b_j\int_\tau^t(t-\theta)^{-\frac34}(\theta-\tau)^{-1+\frac{j}{4}}\,d\theta\\ &=b_j(t-\tau)^{-\frac34+\frac{j}{4}}\int_0^1(1-r)^{-\frac34}r^{-1+\frac{j}{4}}\,dr\ =b_j(t-\tau)^{-\frac34+\frac{j}{4}}2^{j/4-3/4}\frac{\Gamma(\frac14)\cdot\Gamma(\frac{j}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{j+1}{4})}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Recall now the definition of b_j and, from the last integral, obtain b_{j+1}. Thus, (3.24) follows for $j+1$ and by induction for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Remark 3.11. *Let us explicitly remark that the assertion we have proved can be reformulated saying that the convolution of a family of kernels of uniform exponential ε-type $1/2$ with a family of kernels with uniform exponential ε-type β is a family of kernels with uniform exponential ε-type $\beta + 1/2$.*

For every $\varepsilon > 0$ the operators L_ε and $L_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ are uniformly elliptic, so that the proof of the convergence of the parametrix method is a well known fact (see [23]). In particular $\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ provides a good approximation of Γ_ε in a neighborhood of the plane. More precisely

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_\varepsilon((x,t),(z,\tau)) &= \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau)) \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\times[\tau,t]} \Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\,\Phi_\varepsilon((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\rho_\varepsilon(y_1-z_1)\,dyd\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

In addition, for $i = 1, \cdots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned}X^2_{i,0,\varepsilon}\Gamma_\varepsilon((x,t),(z,\tau)) &= X^2_{i,0,\varepsilon}\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau)) \\ + \quad &\lim_{\delta\to 0^+}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\times[\tau,t-\delta]} X^2_{i,0,\varepsilon}\Gamma_{y_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(y,\theta))\Phi_\varepsilon((y,\theta),(z,\tau))\rho_\varepsilon(y_1-z_1)\,dyd\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Using the explicit representation formulas above we can provide the following estimates for $\Gamma_\varepsilon - \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}$ uniform in ε:

Proposition 3.12. *Let M_0 be a non characteristic plane and $x = (x_1, \hat{x}), z = (z_1, \hat{z}) \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $|x_1|, |z_1| \le \varepsilon^{2\kappa}$. For every $T > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C(T)$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every t, τ with $0 < t - \tau \le T$ the following inequalities hold*

$$|\Gamma_\varepsilon((x,t),(z,\tau)) - \Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau))| \le C(t-\tau)^{1/4}\Gamma_{z_1,\varepsilon}((x,t),(z,\tau)). \tag{3.28}$$

For the proof of (3.28) we refer to [32] or [2], while the uniformity with respect to ε follows by (2.8).

Proof of Theorem 3.1 . To prove Theorem 3.1, first we prove its Riemannian version, i.e. that for all $(0,\hat{z})$, $(0,\hat{x})$ in M_0 and for every t, τ, with $0 < t - \tau \le T$ we have

$$|\hat{\Gamma}_{0,\varepsilon}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{z},\tau)) - \sqrt{4\pi(t-\tau)}\Gamma_\varepsilon((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau))| \le C\Gamma_\varepsilon((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau))(t-\tau)^{3/4} \tag{3.29}$$

and as a consequence

$$|\hat{\Gamma}_{0,\varepsilon}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{z},\tau)) - \sqrt{4\pi(t-\tau)}\Gamma_\varepsilon((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau))| \le C\hat{\Gamma}_{0,\varepsilon}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{z},\tau))(t-\tau)^{1/4}, \tag{3.30}$$

where C is a constant independent of ε.

Indeed,

$$\sqrt{4\pi(t-\tau)}\Gamma_\varepsilon((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau)) - \hat{\Gamma}_{0,\varepsilon}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{z},\tau)) =$$

$$= \sqrt{4\pi(t-\tau)}\Gamma_{0,\varepsilon}((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau)) - \hat{\Gamma}_{0,\varepsilon}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{z},\tau))$$

$$+\sqrt{4\pi(t-\tau)}\Big(\Gamma_{\varepsilon}((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau)) - \Gamma_{0,\varepsilon}((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau))\Big).$$

Now, the first difference at the right hand side is zero by Remark 3.3, since

$$\sqrt{4\pi(t-\tau)}\Gamma_{\perp,0,\varepsilon}((0,\hat{x},t),(0,\hat{z},\tau)) = 1$$

and hence the estimate (3.29) follows by (3.28). To obtain (3.30), it is sufficient to use again Remark 3.3. b

Sending ε to 0 in the assertion (3.29), we obtain that for all $z = (0,\hat{z})$, $x = (0,\hat{x})$ in M_0 and for every t and τ, with $0 < t - \tau < T$, we have

$$|\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{z},\tau)) - \sqrt{t-\tau}\Gamma((x,t),(z,\tau))| \leq C\Gamma((x,t),(z,\tau))(t-\tau)^{3/4}.$$

Theorem 3.1 now follows immediately. □

4. An approximate reproducing formula for sub-Laplacian type operators

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3, which will be stated in a more precise way in Theorem 4.5 below. Since the fundamental solution of the Laplace operator can be obtained from the heat kernel, simply integrating in time, we will deduce the result, via an integral version of Theorem 3.1.

As usual, M_0 denotes the plane $\{(0,\hat{x}) \in \mathbb{G} \,|\, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}$. Thanks to assumption (1.5), the vector fields $\{X_{i,0}\}_{i=2,\cdots,m}$, defined in (3.1), generate a distance $\hat{d}$ on M_0 defined through the exponential map as in (2.6), which satisfies

$$\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{z}) = d_{0,0}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z})). \tag{4.1}$$

As a consequence, using Lemma 3.8 restricted to the plane M_0, we have:

Lemma 4.1. *For every $x = (0,\hat{x})$ and $z = (0,\hat{z})$,*

$$\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{z}) = d((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z})). \tag{4.2}$$

We note that the homogeneous dimension of the plane is

$$\hat{Q} = Q - 1.$$

We first establish the result under the assumption that the vector fields are homogeneous and can be represented as in (2.3). Then, with a new subriemannian application of the parametrix method, we show that the same formula remains true for a class of more general vector fields. This will be accomplished with an adaptation of the classical approach due to Rothschild and Stein [39], or Jerison and Sanchez Calle [32].

4.1. **The reproducing formula for homogeneous sub-Laplacian type operators.** Let us first deduce an integral version of Theorem 3.1, based on the reproducing formula of the heat kernel. Here the vector fields satisfy (2.3).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $D = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 > 0\}$, with non characteristic points on the boundary. There exists $C > 0$ such that for any $(0, \hat{x}), (0, \hat{y}) \in \partial D$ and for all t, τ, with $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ we have*

$$\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x}, t), (\hat{y}, \tau)) = \tag{4.3}$$
$$= \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{z}, \theta))\Gamma((0, \hat{z}, \theta), (0, \hat{y}, \tau))d\hat{z}d\theta + \hat{R}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, t - \tau),$$

and

$$|\hat{R}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, t))| \leq Ct^{3/4}\Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{y}, 0)).$$

Proof. Let us first note that the thesis is true for $t - \tau \geq 1$. Indeed by the standard properties of the fundamental solution

$$\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x}, t), (\hat{y}, \tau)) \leq c(t - \tau)^{1/2}\Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{y}, \tau)) \leq c(t - \tau)^{3/4}\Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{y}, \tau))$$

and

$$\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{z}, \theta))\Gamma((0, \hat{z}, \theta), (0, \hat{y}, \tau))d\hat{z}d\theta \leq c(t - \tau)^{3/4}\Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{y}, \tau)).$$

If $t - \tau < 1$, by Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{z}, \theta)) = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x}, t), (\hat{z}, \theta))}{\sqrt{t - \theta}}(1 + O(t - \theta)^{1/4}). \tag{4.4}$$

Thus,

$$\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{z}, \theta))\Gamma((0, \hat{z}, \theta), (0, \hat{y}, \tau))d\hat{z}d\theta$$
$$= \int_\tau^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x}, t), (\hat{z}, \theta))\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{z}, \theta), (\hat{y}, \tau))d\hat{z} \right.$$
$$\left. \left(\frac{1}{(t - \theta)^{1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{(t - \theta)^{1/4}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{(\theta - \tau)^{1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\theta - \tau)^{1/4}} \right) \right) \right) d\theta$$
$$= \hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x}, t), (\hat{y}, \tau)) \int_\tau^t \left(\frac{1}{(t - \theta)^{1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{(t - \theta)^{1/4}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{(\theta - \tau)^{1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\theta - \tau)^{1/4}} \right) \right) d\theta,$$

by the reproduction formula. Now, with the change of variable $r = (t - \tau)^{-1}(\theta - \tau)$, we get

$$\int_\tau^t \left(\frac{1}{(t - \theta)^{1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{(t - \theta)^{1/4}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{(\theta - \tau)^{1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\theta - \tau)^{1/4}} \right) \right) d\theta = 1 + O((t - \tau)^{1/4}).$$

Therefore, we get

$$\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma((0, \hat{x}, t), (0, \hat{z}, \theta))\Gamma((0, \hat{z}, \theta), (0, \hat{y}, \tau))d\hat{z}d\theta \tag{4.5}$$

$$= \hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{y},\tau))(1+O((t-\tau)^{1/4})$$
$$= \hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{y},\tau)) + O(\Gamma((0,x,t),(0,y,\tau))(t-\tau)^{3/4}).$$

This concludes the proof.

□

We obtain now the time independent version of Lemma 4.2. Integrating in time, and using the well known fact that the fundamental solutions $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$ of the Laplace type operator (3.2) and Γ_Δ of the Laplace operator (1.2) satisfy respectively

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{z}) = \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x},t)(\hat{z},0))dt, \quad \Gamma_\Delta(x,z) = \int_0^{+\infty} \Gamma((x,t),(z,0))dt. \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $M_0 = \{(0,\hat{x}) : \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}$ be a non characteristic plane. For any $(0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}) \in M_0$*

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z}))\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y}))d\hat{z} + \hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}), \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) = O(\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{y})^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y})). \tag{4.8}$$

In particular $\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y})$ is a kernel of type $5/2$ in the sense of Definition 2.3.

Proof. Using (4.6) and integrating both sides of expression (4.3) we obtain:

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) + \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{R}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{y},0))dt$$
$$= \int_0^{+\infty}\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma((0,\hat{x},t-\theta),(0,\hat{z},0))\Gamma((0,\hat{z},\theta),(0,\hat{y},0))d\hat{z}\,d\theta\,dt.$$

Changing the order of integration, we get that the last term is equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_0^{+\infty}\left(\int_\theta^{+\infty} \Gamma((0,\hat{x},t-\theta),(0,\hat{z},0))\,dt\right)\Gamma((0,\hat{z},\theta),(0,\hat{y},0))\,d\theta d\hat{z}$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_0^{+\infty} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z}))\Gamma((0,\hat{z},\theta),(0,\hat{y},0))d\theta d\hat{z}$$

and integrating with respect to θ we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{z}))\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y}))d\hat{z}.$$

The estimate of $\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y})$ directly follows easily integrating in (4.5) and using the estimate of $\hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x},ct),(\hat{y},0))$ provided in Lemma 4.2. Therefore we have

$$\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) = \int_0^{+\infty} \hat{R}((\hat{x},t),(\hat{y},0))dt \leq$$
$$\leq c\int_0^{+\infty} \hat{\Gamma}((\hat{x},ct),(\hat{y},0))t^{1/4}dt \leq c\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-\frac{\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{y})^2}{Ct}}}{t^{\frac{Q}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}}\,dt,$$

where the constants may vary from line to line. Now, with the change of variables $v = -\frac{\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{y})^2}{Ct}$ we get

$$\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-v} \frac{v^{\frac{Q}{2}-\frac{9}{4}}}{\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{y})^{n-\frac{5}{2}}}\, dv \leq c\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{y})^{-Q+2+\frac{1}{2}} \leq c\hat{d}(\hat{x},\hat{y})^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y})\,,$$

and the result is proved. □

4.2. **The reproducing formula for a more general operator.** In this section we prove a reproducing formula analogous to Lemma 4.3 for a slightly more general class of vector fields and Laplace operator. Here we deal only with a set D which is be a half space as before, with ∂D a non characteristic plane. Assume that $0 \in \partial D$. We will assume that there exists a neighborhood of 0 and smooth function $w : \partial D \cap V \to R$ such that $w(0) = 0$, $X_i w(0) = 0$ and the vector fields X_i can be represented as follows in V:

$$X_1 = \partial_1, \quad X_i = \partial_i + \sum_{deg(j)>deg(i)} a_{i,j}(x_1 + w(\hat{x}), \hat{x})\partial_j + X_i w \partial_1, \tag{4.9}$$

where the polynomials a_{ij} are the same as defined in (2.3). These operators will be useful in section 5, while dealing with a set D, whose boundary will be the graph of a smooth function w. Note that the change of variable

$$\Xi(x_1 + w(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) = (x_1, \hat{x})$$

changes the present vector fields X_i in the ones defined in (2.3). Hence the associated operator, analogous to (1.2)

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{m} X_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i X_i$$

has a fundamental solution Γ_Δ, of class C^∞ out of the pole.

As before we restrict the vector fields X_i to ∂D and we call them $\hat{X}_i$:

$$\hat{X}_i = \partial_i + \sum_{deg(j)=deg(i)+1}^{\kappa} a_{i,j}(w(\hat{x}), \hat{x})\partial_j, \quad i = 2, \cdots, n.$$

As before we will assume that the vector fields $\hat{X}_i$ satisfy the assumption (1.5).

The associated operator will be expressed as

$$\hat{\Delta} = \sum_{i=2}^{m} \hat{X}_i^2, \tag{4.10}$$

with fundamental solution $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$.

We give now the definition of kernel of local type λ with respect to the vectors fields $\hat{X}_2, \cdots, \hat{X}_n$:

Definition 4.4. *k is a kernel of local type λ with respect to the vectors fields $\hat{X}_2, \cdots, \hat{X}_n$ and the distance $\hat{d}$ if it is a smooth function out of the diagonal and in any open set V*

the following holds: for every p there exists a positive constant C_p such that, for every $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in \partial D \cap V$, $\hat{x} \neq \hat{y}$,

$$|\hat{X}_{i_1}, \cdots, \hat{X}_{i_p} k(\hat{x}, \hat{y})| \leq C_p \, \hat{d}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})^{\lambda - p - 2} \frac{\hat{d}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})^2}{|B(\hat{x}, \hat{d}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}))|}.$$

Clearly, if the space is homogeneous, the previous definition coincides with Definition 2.3.

We will prove the main result of the section, which generalizes Theorem 1.3 to the present setting and is analogous of Lemma 4.3 for these fundamental solution:

Theorem 4.5. *Let $M_0 = \{(0, \hat{x}) : \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}$ be a non characteristic plane. For any $(0, \hat{x}), (0, \hat{y}) \in M_0$*

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta}((0, \hat{x}), (0, \hat{z})) \Gamma_{\Delta}((0, \hat{z}), (0, \hat{y})) d\hat{z} + \hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$\hat{R}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = O(\hat{d}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) \tag{4.12}$$

is a kernel of local type $5/2$ with respect to the vector fields $\hat{X}_2, \cdots, \hat{X}_n$.

The proof is made approximating the vector fields with nilpotent ones, adapting to this context the Rothschild and Stein parametrix method. In the classical case the vector fields are lifted to vector fields free up to step κ and then they are reduced to the generators of a free algebra with a freezing method. Here we can not lift the vector fields to free ones otherwise we would loose assumption (1.5). However, since the group $\mathbb{G}$ considered here is a stratified Carnot group, we can use the invariance properties of the space in order to obtain an ad hoc version of the Rothschild and Stein method.

For every z in a neighborhood of 0 we define operators $X_{i,z}$ which approximate X_i around the point z, arguing as in Lemma 3.4 and in Proposition 4.9.

Proposition 4.6. *There exist open neighborhoods U of 0 and V, W of $0 \in \partial D \subset G$, with $W \subset V$ and for every z fixed in W a change of coordinates Ξ_z such that*

- *for every $z \in W$, the function $x \to \Xi_z(x)$ is a diffeomorphism from U on the image*
- *in the new coordinates the vector fields will admit the following representation:*

$$\Xi_z(X_1) = \partial_{y_1}$$

$$d\Xi_z(X_i) = \partial_{y_i} + \sum_{deg(j) > deg(i)} a_{i,j}(y_1 + w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) \partial_{y_j} + X_i w \partial_{y_1}, \quad i = 2, \cdots, n.$$

Proof. Let us call $M = \{(w(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) : \hat{x} \in V \cap \partial D\}$. For every $z \in M$ we will denote T_z the group homomorphism which sends 0 to z and whose differential sends $X_{1|0}$ in the normal $\nu(z)$ at M in z and $X_{2|0}, \cdots X_{n|0}$ in a basis of the tangent space to M at z. If we fix z the

implicit function theorem ensures that there exists a neighborhood $U = I \times \hat{U}$ of 0 and a function $w_z : \hat{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $w_z(0) = 0$, $\nabla_z w_z(0) = 0$, and

$$\{(w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) : \hat{y} \in \hat{U}\} = T_z^{-1}(M) \cap U,$$

so that $\{T_z(w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) : \hat{y} \in \hat{U}\} \subset M \cap V$. Due to the regularity of the boundary we can find an open set $W \subset V$ such that for every $z \in W \cap M$ the function w_z is defined on the same set $\hat{U}$ with values in the same set I. Hence we can define the map

$$E_z : U \to V, \quad E_z(y_1, \hat{y}) := T_z(y_1 + w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}).$$

E_z is invertible on its image and sends the plane $\{y_1 = 0\} \cap U$ into a suitable subset of M. The composition $E_0^{-1} E_z$ sends the plane $\{y_1 = 0\}$ into the the plane $\{x_1 = 0\}$, boundary of D. For every $z \in W \cap M$ its inverse function $\Xi_z(x)$ is a diffeomorphism on its image and $\Xi_z(W) \subset U \subset \Xi_z(V)$ The vector fields X_i can be represented as follows in the new coordinates (see also [1], [15]):

$$d\Xi_z(X_1) = \partial_{y_1} \quad d\Xi_z(X_i) = \partial_{y_i} + \sum_{deg(j) > deg(i)} a_{i,j}(y_1 + w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) \partial_{y_j} + X_i w \partial_{y_1}, \quad i = 2, \cdots, n.$$

□

We can now prove the following analogous of Corollary 3.5:

Lemma 4.7. *With the same notations of the previous Proposition 4.6, let us call*

$$Z_i = \partial_{y_i} + \sum_{deg(j) > deg(i)} a_{ij}(y) \partial_{y_j},$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then we have

$$d\Xi_z(X_i) - Z_i = R_{i,z,\Xi}$$

where $R_{i,z,\Xi}$ are vector fields of local degree $\leq deg(i) - 1$ depending smoothly on z. Precisely $R_{i,z,\Xi} = \sum_j r_{ij,z} \partial_j$ where $r_{ij,z} = O(d(x,y)^{deg(j) - deg(i) - 1})$.

Proof. It is a direct computation. Indeed the assertion is true for $i = 1$. For every $i > 1$ the difference $d\Xi_z(X_i) - Z_i$ can be expressed as

$$d\Xi_z(X_i) - Z_i = \sum_{deg(j) > deg(i)} \Big(a_{ij}(y_1 - w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) - a_{ij}(y_1, \hat{y}) \Big) \partial_{y_j} + X_i w_z(\hat{y}) \partial_{y_1}.$$

We first note that, since $X_i w_z(0) = 0$, then $X_i w_z(\hat{y}) \partial_{y_1}$ is an operator of degree 0. Moreover, being a_{ij} homogeneous polynomials, their difference can be represented as a homogeneous polynomial. Precisely there exists a suitable polynomial a_{ij}^1 homogeneous of degree $deg(i) - deg(j) - 1$ such that

$$a_{ij}(y_1 - w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) - a_{ij}(y_1, \hat{y}) = w_z(\hat{y}) a_{ij}^1(y_1, y_1 - w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}) =$$

$$= O(\|\hat{y}\|^2) a_{ij}^1(y_1, y_1 - w_z(\hat{y}), \hat{y}),$$

since w_z and its gradient vanish at $\hat{y} = 0$. □

Note that changing again variables and calling $X_{i,z} = d\Xi_z{}^{-1}(Z_i)$, from Theorem 4.7 we immediately get:

$$X_i = X_{i,z} + R_{i,z},$$

where $R_{i,z} = d\Xi_z{}^{-1}(R_{i,z,\Xi})$ is an operator of degree $\leq deg(i) - 1$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

A similar relation holds between the vector fields restricted to the boundary:

Lemma 4.8. *Using the same notation of Proposition 4.6 and setting*

$$\hat{Z}_i = \partial_{y_i} + \sum_{deg(j)>deg(i)} a_{ij}(0, \hat{y})\partial_{y_j},$$

we get:

$$d\hat{\Xi}_z(\hat{X}_i) = \hat{Z}_i + \hat{R}_{i,z,\Xi}$$

where $\hat{R}_{i,z,\Xi}$ are vector fields of local degree $\leq deg(i) - 1$ depending smoothly on $z \in W$.

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the proof of the previous lemma, hence we omit it. □

Calling $\hat{X}_{i,z} = d\hat{\Xi}_z^{-1}(\hat{Z}_i) \quad i = 2, \cdots, n$, we obtain from Lemma 4.8,

$$\hat{X}_i = \hat{X}_{i,z} + \hat{R}_{i,z},$$

where $\hat{R}_{i,z} = d\hat{\Xi}_z^{-1}(\hat{R}_{i,z,\Xi})$ are vector fields of local degree $\leq deg(i) - 1$ for $i = 2, \cdots, n$.

We will also define the associated sub-Laplacian type operators:

$$\Delta_z = \sum_{i=1}^{m} X_{i,z}^2, \quad \hat{\Delta}_z = \sum_{i=2}^{m} \hat{X}_{i,z}^2, \quad \Delta_Z = \sum_{i=1}^{m} Z_i^2, \quad \hat{\Delta}_Z = \sum_{i=2}^{m} \hat{Z}_i^2, \tag{4.13}$$

with fundamental solutions $\Gamma_{z,\Delta}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_{z,\hat{\Delta}}$, Γ_{Δ_Z} and $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}_Z}$ respectively. Note that Γ_{Δ_Z} and $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}_Z}$ do not depend on the fixed point z.

We can now apply the parametrix method of [32], recalled in (2.23) to estimate the fundamental solutions Γ_Δ and $\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}$. The argument is similar to the one applied in section 3, but, differently from before, the proof is now standard, since we do not have to take care of the different homogeneous dimensions of the Riemannian and subriemannian structures.

Lemma 4.9. *Let us consider the operators defined in* (4.13)*. Then*

$$H = \Delta - \Delta_z \quad \hat{H} = \hat{\Delta} - \hat{\Delta}_z$$

are differential operators of degree 1. As a consequence

$$\Gamma_\Delta(x, z) - \Gamma_{z,\Delta}(x, z) = \Gamma_\Delta(x, z) - \Gamma_{\Delta_Z}(\Xi_z(x), 0)$$

are kernels of type 3*, with respect to the vector fields X_i. Analogously*

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{z}) - \hat{\Gamma}_{z,\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{z}) = \hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{z}) - \hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}_Z}(\hat{\Xi}_{\hat{z}}(\hat{x}), 0)$$

are kernels of type 3 *with respect to the vector fields $\hat{X}_i$.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.5:

Proof of Theorem 4.5. By Lemma 4.9,

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{z}) - \hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}_Z}(\hat{\Xi}_{\hat{z}}(\hat{x}),0) \tag{4.14}$$

is a kernel of type 3 with respect to the vector fields $\hat{X}_i$. For the vector fields $(Z_i)_{i=1,\cdots,n}$ and the fundamental solution associated to the corresponding sub-Laplacian type operator, we can apply Lemma 4.3, so that

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta_Z}(\hat{\Xi}_{\hat{z}}(\hat{x}),0) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y}$$

is a kernel of type 5/2 with respect to the vector fields $\hat{X}_{i,z}$. Using Lemma 4.8 we deduce that a kernel has the same type with respect to the vector fields $\hat{X}_i$ and $\hat{X}_{i,z}$, so that from now on we will simply specify the type of the kernel omitting the corresponding vector fields. Inserting in (4.14) we get that

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{z}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y} \tag{4.15}$$

is a kernel of type 5/2. Applying again Lemma 4.9 we deduce that the following difference,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y} =$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Big(\Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y} - \Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))\Big)d\hat{y} +$$

$$+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Big(\Gamma_{\Delta_Z}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y})) - \Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Big)\Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y},$$

is a kernel of type 7/2.

As a consequence, we deduce from here and (4.15) that

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{z}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{x}),(0,\hat{y}))\Gamma_{\Delta}((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{y}$$

is a kernel of type 5/2. The proof is done. □

5. Poisson kernel and Schauder estimates at the boundary

Let $D = \{x = (x_1,\hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 > 0\}$ be the half space with ∂D a non characteristic plane. Consider a sub-Laplacian type operator Δ defined in D, as in (1.2), in terms of the vector fields $\{X_i\}_{i=1,\cdots,m}$ introduced in (4.9) and the corresponding Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta u = f \text{ in } D, \quad u = g \text{ on } \partial D. \tag{5.1}$$

for a suitable boundary datum g and a smooth function f defined on D.

In this section we prove our main results, the construction of a Poisson kernel in Theorem 1.2 and the Schauder estimates at the boundary stated in Theorem 1.1.

On the set ∂D we have a distance $\hat{d}$ defined in (4.1), in terms of the vector fields $\{\hat{X}_i\}_i$, recalled below. The corresponding spaces of Hölder continuous functions, defined as in Definition 2.1 in terms of these vector fields, will be denoted $\hat{C}^{k,\alpha}$.

We look for a Poisson operator in a neighborhood of a point $x_0 \in \partial D$. Let V be a neighborhood of the point x_0. We say that $P : C^\infty(V \cap \partial D) \to C^\infty(V \cap \overline{D})$ is a local Poisson operator for the problem (5.1) if, for every $g \in C^\infty(V \cap \partial D)$, the function $u := P(g)$ satisfies $\Delta u = 0$ in $D \cap V$ and $u(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in \partial D \cap V$. We will construct a parametrix for the Poisson kernel of the Dirichlet problem, adapting to the present setting a method introduced by Grainer and Stein [26] and Jerison [30].

As in the previous section, the restriction to the plane of a basis of vector fields $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ is denoted by $\hat{X}_1, \cdots, \hat{X}_n$. By assumption (1.5), the vector fields $\hat{X}_1, \cdots, \hat{X}_n$. satisfy the Hörmander condition. The associated distance $\hat{d}$ has been defined in (4.1), and the associated Laplace operator $\hat{\Delta}$ in (4.10).

The method introduced by Grainer and Stein [26] and Jerison [30] consists in using as a parametrix for the fundamental solution. We consider the approximating kernel

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta * \Delta}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_\Delta((0, \hat{x}), (0, \hat{z}))\Gamma_\Delta((0, \hat{z}), (0, \hat{y}))d\hat{z},$$

found in Theorem 4.5.

In analogy with (2.25) we call

$$R_1(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \hat{\Delta}\Big(\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - \hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta * \Delta}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})\Big).$$

In the present case R_1 can be estimated using (4.11) and it is a kernel of type 1/2. As in (2.26) we now call

$$\Phi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (E_{R_1})^j (R_1)(\hat{x}, \hat{y}).$$

Using a standard singular integral argument, we deduce that the series uniformly converges on any bounded open set V_0 and it is a kernel of type 1/2. As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta((0, \hat{x}), (0, \hat{z}))\Phi(\hat{z}, \hat{y})d\hat{z} \ \text{ is of type } 3/2 \\ &\text{and} \quad \hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta * \Delta} * \Phi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \ \text{ is of type } 5/2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

In addition the fundamental solution of the operator $\hat{\Delta}$ can be represented as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta * \Delta}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) + \hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta * \Delta} * \Phi(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), \tag{5.3}$$

for $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in V_0 \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

We are now in position to state in a precise way and prove Theorem 1.2. Since we are proving a local property, it is not restrictive that the boundary datum g is compactly supported.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $D = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : x_1 > 0\}$ be a half space with non characteristic boundary. Let $\bar{x} \in \partial D$, and let V_0 be the neighborhood of $\bar{x}$ introduced in* (5.2)*. Let $g \in C_0^\infty(\partial D \cap V_0)$ and define*

$$K_1(g)(\hat{y}) := \int_{\partial D\cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{z}))\hat{\Delta}g(\hat{z})d\hat{z}, \tag{5.4}$$

$$R(g)(\hat{y}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\cap V_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{y}),(0,\hat{s}))\Phi((0,\hat{s}),(0,\hat{z}))\hat{\Delta}g(\hat{z})d\hat{s}d\hat{z}$$

and

$$K : C^\infty(\partial D\cap V_0)\to C^\infty(\partial D\cap V_0), \quad K := K_1 + R. \tag{5.5}$$

For any neighborhood $V \subset\subset V_0$ of $\bar{x}$ the operator

$$P(g)(x) : \int_{\partial D\cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{y}))K(g)(\hat{y})d\hat{y} \tag{5.6}$$

is a local Poisson operator of (5.1) *in V.*

Proof. Since Γ_Δ is the fundamental solution of Δ, then the function $u = P(g)(x)$ satisfies $\Delta u = 0 \quad in \quad V\cap D$. Hence by (5.3), we have

$$P(g)(0,\hat{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta*\Delta}(\hat{x},\hat{y}) + \hat{\Gamma}_{\Delta*\Delta} * \Phi(\hat{x},\hat{y})\right)\hat{\Delta}g(\hat{y})d\hat{y} =$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\Delta}}(\hat{x},\hat{y}))\hat{\Delta}g(\hat{y})d\hat{y} = g(\hat{x}).$$

□

Let us now study the properties of the operator P. Since it can be represented as in (5.6) we will start with the properties of K.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $D = \{(x_1,\hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{n-1} : x_1 > 0\}$ be a half space with non characteristic boundary. Then for every $V \subset\subset V_0$ there is a constant C_1 such that for every $g \in \hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V_0)$*

$$\|K(g)\|_{\hat{C}^{1,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V)} \le C_1\|g\|_{\hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V_0)}. \tag{5.7}$$

In addition there is a constant C_2 such that if $g \in C_0^\infty(\partial D\cap V_0)$, then

$$K(g) \in \left\{\varphi : \ |\varphi(\hat{z})| \le C_2\hat{d}^{1-\hat{Q}}(\hat{z},\mathrm{supp}(g)) \ \forall\hat{z} \ s.t. \ \hat{d}(\hat{z},\mathrm{supp}(g)) \ge 2\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathrm{supp}(g))\right\}.$$

Proof. Let us first consider the kernel defining the operator K_1, which is the fundamental solution $\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y}))$. This is a kernel of type 2 with respect to the distance d in the sense of definition 4.4. Because of inequality (4.2) we deduce that there are constants C_1, C_2 such that

$$C_1\hat{d}(\hat{z},\hat{y})^{1-\hat{Q}} \le \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y})) \le C_2\hat{d}(\hat{z},\hat{y})^{1-\hat{Q}} \tag{5.8}$$

so that $\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y}))$ is a kernel of type 1 with respect to the distance $\hat{d}$ induced on ∂D, and the derivatives of $\Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{y}))$ are singular integrals. Analogously we consider the kernel which defines R, which is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\cap V_0} \Gamma_\Delta((0,\hat{z}),(0,\hat{s}))\Phi((0,\hat{s}),(0,\hat{y}))d\hat{s}.$$

We have seen in (5.2) that it is a kernel of type 3/2. Therefore the sum of these two kernels, which defines K, is of type 1 with respect to the distance $\hat{d}$. In particular (5.7) directly follows (see for example [37]).

The decay property of K immediately follows, since

$$d(\hat{z},\hat{y}) \geq d(\hat{z}, \operatorname{supp} g)$$

for all $\hat{y} \in \operatorname{supp} g$ and for all $\hat{z}$ such that $\hat{d}(\hat{z}, \operatorname{supp} g) \geq 2\operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp} g)$. □

Let us now conclude the proof of the boundedness of P.

Theorem 5.3. *Let V, V_0 be open sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $V \subset\subset V_0$, let $g \in \hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D \cap V_0)$. Then there is a constant C_1 such that*

$$\|P(g)\|_{\hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V)} \leq C_1 \|g\|_{\hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V_0)}. \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. Let us fix V_1 such that $V \subset\subset V_1 \subset\subset V_0$. Thanks to the previous lemma we only have to prove that the operator

$$\widetilde{K} : \hat{C}^{1,\alpha}(\partial D \cap V_0) \cap \Big\{\varphi : \ |\varphi(\hat{z})| \leq C\hat{d}^{1-\hat{Q}}(\hat{z}, \operatorname{supp}(g)),$$

$$\forall \hat{z} \text{ s.t. } \hat{d}(\hat{z}.\operatorname{supp}(g)) \geq 2\operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp}(g))\Big\} \to C^{2,\alpha}(D \cap V_0)$$

defined as

$$\widetilde{K}(\varphi)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{z}))\varphi(\hat{z})d\hat{z}$$

satisfies

$$\|\widetilde{K}(\varphi)\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(D\cap V)} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\hat{C}^{1,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V_0)}. \tag{5.10}$$

It is standard to recognize that it is bounded as operator with values in $\hat{C}^{2,\alpha}(\partial D \cap V_0)$ (see for example [26], [37]). Hence we have to estimate the normal derivative. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(V_1)$ such that $\psi \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of V and let $x \in V$ and $\varphi \in \hat{C}^{1,\alpha}(\partial D \cap V_0)$.

$$\partial_1 \widetilde{K}(\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \partial_1\Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{z}))\varphi(\hat{z})d\hat{z}$$

$$= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\cap V_1} < \nu, \nabla\Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{z})) > \varphi(\hat{z})\psi(0,\hat{z})d\hat{z} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} < \nu, \nabla\Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{z})) > \varphi(\hat{z})(1-\psi(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{z}$$

$$= -\int_{V_1\cap D} < \nabla\Gamma_\Delta(x,(z)), \nabla(\varphi\psi)(z) > dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\setminus V_1} < \nu, \nabla\Gamma_\Delta(x,(0,\hat{z})) > \varphi(\hat{z})(1-\psi(0,\hat{z}))d\hat{z}.$$

If $x \in V$ the last integral contains a C^∞ kernel since $\psi = 1$, on a closed set which contains V in the interior. Standard singular integral theory applied to the first integral ensure that

$$\|\partial_1\widetilde{K}(\varphi)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(D\cap V)} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{\hat{C}^{1,\alpha}(\partial D\cap V_0)}.$$

Assertion (5.10) is proved, so that the thesis follows. □

From here it immediately follows:

Corollary 5.4. *Assume that the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.3 are satisfied. If* $V \subset\subset V_0$, $k \in \{0,1\}$, $f \in C^{k,\alpha}(V_0)$, *and*

$$G(f) := \Gamma_\Delta * f - P((\Gamma_\Delta * f)_{|\partial D \cap V_0}),$$

there exists a constant C *such that*

$$\|G(f)\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(V)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^\alpha(V_0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|G(\nabla f)\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}(V)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(V_0)}. \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from properties of singular integrals (see [42]) and the boundedness of P established in Theorem 5.3. The last inequality follows applying the same instruments to

$$G(\nabla f) = \nabla\Gamma_\Delta * f - P((\nabla\Gamma_\Delta * f)_{|\partial D \cap V_0}).$$

□

Let $D = \{(x_1, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : x_1 > 0\}$ be a half space as above, and consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = f & \text{in } D, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

From Theorem 5.1 it easily follows

Theorem 5.5. *If* $f \in C_0^\infty(V_0)$ *and* $g \in C_0^\infty(\partial D \cap V_0)$ *and*

$$G(f) = \Gamma_\Delta * f - P(\Gamma_\Delta * f)_{|\partial D \cap V_0}),$$

then the function $u = G(f) + P(g)$ *solves the problem*

$$\Delta u = f \text{ in } D, \quad u = g \text{ on } \partial D \cap V_0.$$

As a consequence of the previous theorem, we immediately get an approximate representation formula for a smooth function u.

Lemma 5.6. *Let* $V \subset\subset V_0$ *and let* $u \in C_0^\infty(V)$. *Let us call* $\Delta u = f$ *and* $g = u_{|\partial D \cap V_0}$, *and let* $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(V_0)$, $\varphi = 1$ *on* V. *Then*

$$u = \varphi v + \Gamma_\Delta * \Big(f(1-\varphi) + v\sum_i b_i X_i \varphi\Big) - \nabla\Gamma_\Delta * (v\nabla\varphi) \tag{5.13}$$

where $v = G(f) + P(g)$ *and* b_i *are the coefficients of the operator* Δ *in* (1.2).

Proof. Setting $v = G(\Delta u) + P(u|_{\partial D \cap V_0})$ we have by Theorem 5.5

$$\begin{cases} \Delta(u - \varphi v) & = f(1-\varphi) + \nabla v \nabla\varphi + v\Delta\varphi \qquad \text{in } V_0 \cap D, \\ u - \varphi v & = 0 \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad \text{on } \partial(V_0 \cap D)\,. \end{cases}$$

where we have extended $u - \varphi v$ on the whole space with 0. We deduce by (1.2)

$$u = \varphi v + \Gamma_\Delta * \Big(f(1-\varphi) + \nabla v\nabla\varphi + v\Delta\varphi\Big) =$$

$$= \varphi v + \Gamma_\Delta * \Big(f(1-\varphi) + v\sum_i b_i X_i\varphi\Big) - \nabla\Gamma_\Delta * (v\nabla\varphi).$$

□

5.1. **Schauder estimates.** We can now complete the proof of the Schauder estimates, stated in the introduction:

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let u be a solution of $\Delta u = f$ and $u_{|\partial D} = g$. We will prove the a priori estimates for u under the assumption that $f \in C^\infty(\bar D)$, $g \in C^\infty(\partial D)$ and we will obtain the thesis for $f \in C^\alpha(\bar D)$, $g \in \hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)$ by a density argument. In particular $u \in C^\infty(D)$, and smooth up to the boundary at non characteristic points.

We first note that

$$\|u\|_\infty \le \|g\|_\infty$$

via the maximum principle. In addition, extending g in the interior of D to a function of class $C^{2,\alpha}$, such that $\|g\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(D)} \le \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}$, we see that $u - g$ is a solution of $\Delta(u-g) = f - \Delta g$ in D and $u - g = 0$ on ∂D, hence the Moser iteration technique (see [35]) ensures that there exists a value of β such that $u - g \in C^\beta(\bar D)$, and

$$\|u\|_{C^\beta(\bar D)} \le C\big(\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar D)} + \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}\big). \tag{5.14}$$

We can choose a non characteristic point, say $0 \in \partial D$. There exists a neighborhood V_0 of 0 such that the subriemannian normal

$$\nu(z) \neq 0 \text{ for every } z \in \partial D \cap V_0.$$

We can also choose an invariant basis $(X_i)_{i=1,\cdots,n}$ of the tangent space of $\mathbb{G}$ around the point 0 and X_i coincides with the standard element ∂_i of the tangent basis at the point 0, for every $i = 1, \cdots, n$. In addition, we assume that $X_{1|0} := \partial_{1|0} = \nu(0)$ and that the vector fields $(X_{i|0})_{i=2,\cdots,m}$ span the horizontal tangent space of ∂D at 0. We will also assume that the problem is expressed in canonical coordinates of second type around the point 0 associated to these vector fields. In these coordinates the vector fields admit the representation

$$X_i = \partial_i + \sum_{deg(j)>deg(i)} a_{i,j}(x)\partial_j,$$

while the boundary of D can be identified in a neighborhood $V \subset\subset V_0$ with the graph of a regular function w, defined on a neighborhood $\hat V = V \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ of 0:

$$\partial D \cap V = \{(w(\hat x), \hat x) : \hat x \in \hat V\}.$$

On the set V the function $\Xi(x_1, \hat x) = (x_1 - w(\hat x), \hat x)$ is a diffeomorphism. It sends the boundary of D to the plane

$$\Xi(\partial D \cap V) = \{(y_1, \hat y) : y_1 = 0\}.$$

Through this change of variables the vector fields X_i can be represented as in (4.9)

$$d\Xi(X_1) = \partial_{y_1}, \quad d\Xi(X_i) = \partial_{y_i} + \sum_{deg(j)>deg(i)} a_{i,j}(y_1 + w(\hat y), \hat y)\partial_{y_j} + X_i w(\hat y)\partial_{y_1},$$

so that the results of the previous section apply.

Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(V)$, let V_1 be an open set such that $V \subset\subset V_1$, $\varphi_1 \in C_0^\infty(V_1)$ and identically 1 on V. Define

$$v := G(\Delta(\varphi u)) + P((\varphi u)_{|\partial D\cap V}) = G\Big(f\varphi + \nabla\varphi\nabla u + \Delta\varphi u\Big) + P((\varphi u)_{|\partial D\cap V}). \tag{5.15}$$

By (5.13) we get

$$\varphi u = \varphi_1 v + \Gamma_\Delta * \Big(f(1-\varphi_1) - v\sum_i b_i X_i\varphi_1\Big) + \nabla\Gamma_\Delta * (v\nabla\varphi_1). \tag{5.16}$$

Then, from previous expressions and using (5.11), for nested open sets $V \subset\subset V_3 \subset\subset V_2 \subset\subset V_1 \subset\subset V_0$ and for every $\gamma \le \alpha$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi u\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(V_3\cap D)} &\le C\big(\|v\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(V_2\cap D)} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(V_2\cap D)}\big) \\ &\le C\big(\|u\|_{C^\gamma(V_1\cap D)} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar D)} + \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

In particular, using this inequality and the uniform estimate of $\|\varphi u\|_{C^\beta(\bar D)}$ provided by (5.14) we get for $V \subset\subset V_4 \subset\subset V_3$

$$\|\varphi u\|_{C^\alpha(V_4\cap D)} \le C\|\varphi u\|_{C^{1,\beta}(V_3\cap D)} \le C\big(\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar D)} + \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}\big).$$

Having an estimate of $\|\varphi u\|_{C^\alpha}$ we apply again (5.14) with $\gamma = \alpha$ and we have for $V \subset\subset V_5 \subset\subset V_4$

$$\|\varphi u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(V_5\cap D)} \le C\big(\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar D)} + \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}\big).$$

Finally, we iterate the same argument applying again (5.11) to (5.15) and (5.16). Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(V\cap D)} &\le C\big(\|\varphi u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(V_5\cap D)} + \|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar D)} + \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}\big) \le \\ &\le C\big(\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar D)} + \|g\|_{\hat C^{2,\alpha}(\partial D)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.

□

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, F. Serra Cassano, D. Vittone, Intrinsic regular hypersurfaces in Heisenberg groups, *J. Geom. Anal.* **16** (2006), 187-232.

[2] A. Bonfiglioli, E. Lanconelli, F. Uguzzoni, Fundamental solutions for non-divergence form operators on stratified groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **356** (2004), 2709-2737.

[3] A. Bonfiglioli, E. Lanconelli, F. Uguzzoni, Stratified Lie groups and potential theory for their sub-Laplacians, *Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin,* (2007).

[4] M. Bramanti, L. Brandolini, Schauder estimates for parabolic nondivergence operators of Hörmander type, *J. Differential Equations* **234** (2007), 177-245.

[5] M. Bramanti, L. Brandolini, E. Lanconelli, F. Uguzzoni, Non-divergence equations structured on Hrmander vector fields: heat kernels and Harnack inequalities, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **204**, 961 (2010).

[6] M. Bramanti, M. Zhu, L^p and Schauder estimates for nonvariational operators structured on Hörmander vector fields with drift, *Anal. PDE* **6** (2013), 1793-1855.

[7] L. Caffarelli, L. Silvestre, An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **32** (2007), 1245-1260.

[8] L. Capogna, G. Citti, Regularity for subelliptic PDE through uniform estimates in multi-scale geometries, *Bull. Math. Sci.* **6** (2016), 173-230.
[9] L. Capogna, G. Citti, M. Manfredini, Uniform Gaussian bounds for subelliptic heat kernels and an application to the total variation flow of graphs over Carnot groups, *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces* **1** (2013), 255-275.
[10] L. Capogna, G. Citti, G. Rea, A subelliptic analogue of Aronson-Serrin's Harnack inequality, *Math. Ann.* **357** (2013), 1175-1198.
[11] L. Capogna, G. Citti, C. Senni Guidotti Magnani, Sub-Riemannian heat kernels and mean curvature flow of graphs, *J. Funct. Anal.* **264** (2013), 1899-1928.
[12] L. Capogna, N. Garofalo, Boundary behavior of nonnegative solutions of subelliptic equations in NTA domains for Carnot-Carathéodory metrics, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 4 (1998), 403-432.
[13] L. Capogna, Q. Han, Pointwise Schauder estimates for second order linear equations in Carnot groups, Harmonic analysis at Mount Holyoke (South Hadley, MA, 2001), 45-69, *Contemp. Math.* **320** Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2003).
[14] G. Citti, C^∞ regularity of solutions of a quasilinear equation related to the Levi operator, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **4** 23 (1996), 483-529.
[15] G. Citti, M. Manfredini, Uniform estimates of the fundamental solution for a family of hypoelliptic operators, *Potential Anal.* **25** (2006), 147-164.
[16] M. Di Francesco, S. Polidoro, Schauder estimates, Harnack inequality and Gaussian lower bound for Kolmogorov-type operators in non-divergence form, *Adv. Differential Equations* **11** (2006), 1261-1320.
[17] L. C. Evans, Convergence of an algorithm for mean curvature motion, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **42**, 2 (1993), 533-557.
[18] F. Ferrari, B. Franchi, Harnack inequality for fractional sub-Laplacians in Carnot groups, *Math. Z.* **279** (2015), 435-458.
[19] G. B. Folland, Subelliptic estimates and function spaces on nilpotent Lie groups, *Ark. Mat.* **13** (1975), 161-207.
[20] G. B. Folland E. M. Stein, Estimates for the $\overline{\partial}_b$ complex and analysis on the Heisenberg group, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **27** (1974), 429-522.
[21] B. Franchi, R. P. Serapioni, F. Serra Cassano, Rectifiability and perimeter in the Heisenberg group, *Math. Annalen.* **321**, 3 (2001), 479-531.
[22] B. Franchi, R. P. Serapioni, F. Serra Cassano, Regular hypersurfaces, intrinsic perimeter and implicit function theorem in Carnot groups, *Comm. in Anal. and Geom.* **11**, 5 (2003), 909-944.
[23] A. Friedman, Partial differential equations of parabolic type, *Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.* 1964.
[24] N. Garofalo, D. Vassilev, Regularity near the characteristic set in the non-linear Dirichlet problem and conformal geometry of sub-Laplacians on Carnot groups, *Math. Ann.* 318 (2000), 453-516.
[25] D. Gilbarg, N. S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Reprint of the 1998 edition. Classics in Mathematics, *Springer-Verlag, Berlin,* 2001.
[26] P. C. Greiner, E. M. Stein, Estimates for the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem, Mathematical Notes **19** *Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.*, 1977.
[27] M. Gromov, Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces, *Progress in Mathematics, 152. Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA,* 1999.
[28] C. E. Gutiérrez, E. Lanconelli, Schauder estimates for sub-elliptic equations, *J. Evol. Equ.* **9** (2009), 707-726.
[29] L. Hörmander, Hypoelliptic second order differential equations, *Acta Math.* **119** (1967), 147-171.
[30] D. S. Jerison, The Dirichlet problem for the Kohn Laplacian on the Heisenberg group, I. *J. Funct. Anal.* **43** (1981), 97-142.
[31] D. S. Jerison, The Dirichlet problem for the Kohn Laplacian on the Heisenberg group, II, *J. Funct. Anal.* **43** (1981), 224-257.
[32] D. S. Jerison, A. Sánchez-Calle, Estimates for the heat kernel for a sum of squares of vector fields, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **35** (1986), 835-854.

[33] J. J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg, Non-coercive boundary value problems, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **18** (1965), 443-492.
[34] E. Lanconelli, F. Uguzzoni, On the Poisson kernel for the Kohn Laplacian, *Rend. Mat. Appl.* **7** 17 (1997), 659-677.
[35] J. Moser, A new proof of De Giorgi's theorem concerning the regularity problem for elliptic differential equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **13** (1960), 457-468.
[36] A. Lunardi Schauder estimates for a class of degenerate elliptic and parabolic operators with unbounded coefficients in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **4**, 24 (1997), 133-164.
[37] A. Nagel, E. M. Stein, Lectures on pseudodifferential operators: regularity theorems and applications to nonelliptic problems. Mathematical Notes, *Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo* **24** (1979).
[38] A. Nagel, E. M. Stein, S. Wainger, Balls and metrics defined by vector fields. I. Basic properties, *Acta Math.***155** (1985), 103-147.
[39] L. P. Rothschild, E. M. Stein, Hypoelliptic differential operators and nilpotent groups, *Acta Math.* **137** (1976), 247-320.
[40] A. Sánchez-Calle, Fundamental solutions and geometry of the sum of squares of vector fields, *Invent. Math.* **78** (1984), 143-160.
[41] L. Simon, Schauder estimates by scaling.*Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **5** (1997), 391-407.
[42] E. M. Stein, Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals. *Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo,* (1993).
[43] D. Vassilev, Existence of solutions and regularity near the characteristic boundary for sub-Laplacian equations on Carnot groups. *Pacific J. Math.* **227** (2006), 361-397.
[44] C. J. Xu, Regularity for quasilinear second-order subelliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **45** (1992), 77-96.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Piazza di Porta S. Donato 5, 40126 Bologna, Italy

E-mail address: annalisa.baldi2@unibo.it, giovanna.citti@unibo.it, giovanni.cupini@unibo.it